



# **Long-Term Plan 2024-2034** **(10-year budget)**

**Written Feedback**

**Devonport-Takapuna Volume #1**

April 2024



<b>Sub #</b>	<b>Organisation Name</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
898	All Nations Mission Centre	208
4184	Fibre Cement Solutions Ltd	1170
5675	Badminton North Harbour	1600



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#5



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#5



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important



#5



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

We do not need a new community hub or new build library in Takapuna CBD.

Just upgrade the existing Library if so desired.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Wish list of unaffordable ideas.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

active transport routes and public transport need to be emphasised.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



building roads.

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

The removal of the regional fuel tax was the worst outcome, and anything required to continue the mahi of improving the region's infrastructure is vital.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

active transport routes and public transport need to be emphasised.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

building roads.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

North harbour stadium is too far from public transport, with the albaney bus station being too far for families and less abled people to comfortably walk to. It's not fit for purpose and doesn't foster a community spirit for the people who live in the area, or generate business for the nearby business.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



**Tell us why:**

takes money to make money, and we've privatised everything that matters anyway.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

return the stolen land to Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei and we the residents can pay more rates.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

downtown auckland is no longer the best site for major port operations, they're right in the middle of our best tourism, business and university districts and actively harm all 3.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#12



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

see above.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in	Support



#12



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#12



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

The area is a bottle necked peninsular with one way in or out that takes nearly an hour to move a 100m on a bad day. I know the board can't change this, but it smacks of north shore privilege to focus on some of these items when there is such a disparity across the city. Our children can never afford to live in this area, and it will become a retirement home in 10 years if you cannot make the required changes.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#12**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#28



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Maintaining water and sewage

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Raised pedestrian crossings that cost \$400k plus, reduce signage - too many signs.  
Council staff - too many, little reward. AT too powerful and unchecked!

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Raised pedestrian crossings are a waste of time and money but I support cycle lanes

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised pedestrian crossings and signs!

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

The stadium is well placed with the bus lanes and parking. Recent years have seen this resource under-utilized. Consideration could be given to concerts and other events.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### Tell us why:



Once you have sold the airport shares there will be no opportunity to regain them. Find a way to get a better return.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

The area is an eye-sore, it could be developed into something that is useful and looks good from the shore and the sea.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#64



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#64



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
--	----------------



#64



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Some events and activities need to be self funded, rather than from the Council, it is after all not a charity!

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Idj

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Odj



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Hgd

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Gdtv

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Hftig

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Butch

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	



#89



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Bruh



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Puketāpapa, Rodney

## Puketāpapa Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Puketāpapa in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Invest in opportunities to support local community leadership.	Very Important
Invest in climate change response initiatives and support volunteer groups working on local environmental restoration / protection and climate action programmes.	Fairly Important
Consider our investment in facilities and services to see if there are opportunities to do better.	Not Important
Support initiatives that improve and encourage walking and cycling opportunities.	Not Important
Help coordinate and support local business groups.	I don't know

Tell us why

Nggi

7c. What do you think of the Puketāpapa proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Hgfi



#89



## Rodney Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

Other

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Not Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	Not Important
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	Not Important
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	Fairly Important
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Very Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Very Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	Very Important



#89



Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.

Very Important

**Tell us why**

High

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Her

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Ahuroa

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Hvfdff



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Public transport is dire!! Fix it!!!

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Keep raised crossings and cycleways!

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Crossings and cycleways

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by</p>	<p>Support</p>
--	----------------



#112



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Waitematā

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important



#112



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Manurewa Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Manurewa in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Continue to support, deliver and fund initiatives that contribute to positive youth development.	
Invest in evidence-based projects that focus on crime prevention, safer communities and injury prevention.	
Fund and support activities that include older people and foster their community participation with a specific focus on reaching older migrants.	
Invest in community led projects and initiatives that respond to social connection	



#112



and cohesion, build climate resilience and contribute to climate action.	
Develop a masterplan for Mountfort Park to ensure our open space and sports field network meets the demands of our diverse communities.	
Identify options for recreational activities to support people of all ages and abilities being casually active.	
Investigate community lease options to support Ngāti Tamaoho aspirations for a cultural hub at Te Pua/Keith Park.	
Investigate the feasibility of an arts broker programme to nurture creative expression with a focus on supporting Māori and Pacific creative arts.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Manurewa proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I support most priorities

**Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki in 2024/2025?**

Very Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants.	Very Important
--	----------------



#112



Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme.	Very Important
Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models.	Fairly Important
Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum.	Fairly Important
Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative).	Very Important
Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Support

**7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses**



#112



ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?

Tell us why

## Waitematā Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitematā in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road.	Very Important
Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works.	Very Important
Phased delivery of improvements for Heard Park.	Very Important
Deliver services and programmes that support youth activation, leadership, and wellbeing, particularly in Newmarket.	Fairly Important
Develop programmes that improve perceptions of safety within the City Centre, and our town-centres.	Fairly Important



#112



Support local communities to develop Emergency Planning & Readiness Response Plans.	Fairly Important
Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Waitematā proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#138

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#138



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	Do not support
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Franklin

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Focus on core Council services (collect rubbish, parks, pools, local roads) and do it well.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Reduce the size of Council and focus on the core services as above.

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Transport is important, we all need to get around quickly, efficiently and safely.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Fix pot holes and footpaths - catch up with basic maintenance and keep the roads and footpaths cleaner / tidier.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### Tell us why:

Central Govt should be funding. Don't have confidence that Council will spend the money wisely.



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The port is doing a good job, It doesn't make sense to to take 20 years of dividend up front for a 35 year term (ie leave 15 years of dividend on the table). Keep the port profits within NZ - ie don't lease out to an overseas operator.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

An important yearly contribution to Council to help keep rates down.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

I support opening up of water front land, but the port must be able to construct replacement infrastructure at Bledisloe to cater for the freight task.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

I am against freight being transported back to Auckland from other ports. This is inefficient (costly to the supply-chain and consumers), creates carbon emissions, and makes Auckland vulnerable to other regions and transport links (such as closure of the Bryndwns). There are also vast areas of the Auckland waterfront that are yet to be developed or are poorly developed - more development at Bledisloe is not a priority.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support



#179



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#179



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Refocus on the basics - improve the town centers, especially the tourist destinations- especially the Takapuna waterfront, Devonport (the center looks tired)

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Improve Devonport town center - new footpaths and landscaping. Improve Takapuna beachfront - it's back of house and ugly. Improve the quality of runoff so that our beaches remain open for swimming all summer.



**#179**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We've paid more than enough to see some improvements but we've been suffering traffic everyday. Now the living cost is already heavy as \*\*\*\*\* and you want more from us. Absolutely no! Those proposals look meaningless too. Why don't you think about cutting administrative cost first? Get the right people to do the jobs.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**



Rent the port out. Surely private company would be more efficient. Keep the prepayment for whatever. Just don't increase our rate.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
---	-----------------------



#291



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#291**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Lack of trust in council's ability to manage spending.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Non-essentials.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Lack of trust in council's ability to safely manage a future fund.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



**Tell us here:**

The Waitemata harbour is one of only a handful of viable ports in New Zealand.

It was central to Auckland's establishment as a city, and is an asset we must retain, for both commercial and recreational uses. Retaining ownership of the port is vital to our strategic interests.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

I do not support establishment of the future fund.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

We are a harbour city with the largest population in the country. It is necessary to retain the commercial viability of the port for transmission of cargo and people..... The port area is not, and should not be, used exclusively as a playground.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#344



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	



#344



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	I don't know
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Most priorities do not reflect the wider community's wishes.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Charge library fines - it is a no brainer - \$1m more revenue. East to avoid - bring books back on time.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Stop wasteful spending.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised pedestrian crossings and slow speed zones where no risk exists.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

We have too many stadiums. We need a maximum 8,000 - 10,000 seat stadium on the North Shore, but this has to fit with an overall stadium strategy for Auckland as a whole. Sell Mt Smart and Eden Park and get a super stadium on the waterfront.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:

Brilliant idea - first innovative thinking seen in years.

### 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Private enterprise is best placed to manage commercial operations e.g. Tauranga

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

We need to build resilience

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Love the self-insurance proposal - there is a risk but no risk comes at a high price.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

An opportunity to create the best water front space in the world.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



**Tell us why:**

As above

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
--	----------------



#360



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Take us won the journey - you are leaving us behind. I especially support a new library and community hub in Anzac Square - it is not even in the list priorities instead we have words about intangibles.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Top priority is a new library and community hub in Anzac Square.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Keeping shares in Aucklands critical assets is important

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



Critical assets should remain under Auckland control as a long term investment

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by</p>	<p>Support</p>
--	----------------



#385



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important



#385



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Couldn't find where to review this

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No, people are struggling to pay for home essentials.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

maintain what we have, not build new



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

### Tell us why:

I seriously have doubts about Auckland Transport as an entity. Is there enough transparency and accountability?

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

under utilized, excellent location

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:

## 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Do not support



#401



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>
--	----------------

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Water quality- it is totally unacceptable that beaches must close because of rain flooding our systems. Developers must contribute to the redevelopment of the utilities they are plugging into. Current rate payers cannot be expected to pay.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

<p>Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>



#401



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

This area already has a lot of facilities, and enough money in the community to seek sponsorship.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Use restraint in all matters. Seek private sponsorship, from wealthy Neighbours. As a city we must pay or bills and not pass more debit to future residents, hopefully our children.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Appreciate being asked. You are not going to be able to please EVERYONE.

Keep this region informed of how the debt is dropping.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Support</p>



#411



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important



#411



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No cut back to core services .

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Art installations, libraries,, cultural events, advertising.



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

people are using transport and not paying for. Staff are too afraid to challenge. We are paying more so free loaders travel for free.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Speed humps and zebra crossings

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Not a great stadium .

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Just sort out the core issues.



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I want to pay less rates.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

As an ex employee I have seen terrible waste in the council. It would not be tolerated in a private company. Staff waste council time having morning teas and farewells for just about anything. Management are weak and lack the skills to deal with this. While all the time promoting inept managers to even high positions.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#431



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#431



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More cutting jobs particularly consultants

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Times are tough so get tough ..... no increased expenditure for 5 years

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Everything

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Needs to have more paying events

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Should be used to reduce rates

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Do not support



#465



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#465



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Not Important



#465



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Need to cut expenditure to keep rates down

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Need more ratepayer input or suggestions not just council employees

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Cut costs now



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Prioritise on what we have and protect the environment through better water and waste treatment and ensure beaches and parks cleaned and maintained

Auckland Central is a shambles and an embarrassment so sort it

Stop spending on special events and other nice to do stuff until we can afford it



Get the transport we have working before trying anything new

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop spending on nice to do stuff

Special events

New public transport initiatives - just get current options working !

Any Māori investment

Spend here when infrastructure sorted

Keep rate rise to a minimum

You received a big increase in rate revenue with new valuations recently

Use that wisely

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Just get what we have working in Year one

Then review

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Getting current offer working

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

New offerings when the current is still unreliable

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management



**Tell us why:**

Hardly used now a lot of money tied up for small group of community

Not a priority with other issues

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Cannot cope with more trucks on the roads

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#482



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna



#482



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

Tell us why

Some are nice to do others essential



Get the basics right first and bring in others when initial priorities sorted

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Infrastructure

- water and sewage
- beaches and parks
- Reliable transport

Do not waste money on daft stuff which does not work e.g . All of Takapuna redevelopment while the beach is a mess. Parking building no one uses . Palm trees in pots which were a complete waste- blue markings on some roads no one knows what they mean

Ensure rubbish is collected, not spilling out of bins, loos cleaned, and beach cleaned after events and storms so can be used !

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

You collect serious rates from the Northshore - spend it here so we have great beaches,,parks and walkways. The level of service has dropped considerably post the council amalgamation as has the. Look and feel of all natural resources. Get this right first .



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#519



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important



#519



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

I fill housing. A necessary evil, but uses existing water and other services which will probably become congested and a failure of which is more serious. The negative effect on existing properties is becoming more severe, especially where earlier home owners



are having to pay increased rates to compensate for increased intensity and congestion on all services (roads included, but not limited to). To this end, where properties which are affected by infill housing around them should not be charged extra rates just because a developer has put in multiple housing where there was only one previously. Why should I pay extra rates whereby a new property locally reduces the water flow /pressure, increases the chance of drain blockage, reduces internet speeds and blocks the road with parked and mobile vehicles directly affecting me?

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Get cars off the road to reduce congestion. Speed up transport where able. More electric(hydrogen?) buses to reduce noise and air pollution.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

A rate payer owned facility. It should never be empty- increase usage by concerts, sports, festivals etc. May need an improvement of transport options.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



**Tell us why:**

A finite resource. Economy, reducing waste, and user pays should be the maxim.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Council needs the money to reduce rates. I am retired and cannot afford large increase on my pension.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Rates for operating costs, the Future Fund for development

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Retain the port holdings. Look to reducing container and vehicular shipping with an emphasis on cruise ships. It would then be possible to reduce the port footprint (retaining land ownership) : thereby reducing congestion and improving public usage.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



**Tell us why:**

Improved public usage

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Improved public usage

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#559



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**



I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

People are important and should be supported and consulted.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



Mostly good. Why is council wasting money on a new library when the current one seems to be a very good facility?

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Where roads have had double laning (eg East Coast Rd,/ Forrest Hill Rd Sunnynook), mark in yellow no parking lines the full length to improve traffic speed and reduce chances of accident.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#581



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#581



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	



#581



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Just get the basics of sewage and water sorted out

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Community activites, building things in parks,



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

raised platforms

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#590



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#590



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Make the kerb side composting user pays! So those who compost onsite do not have to be charged.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support any priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important



#590



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

None of the priorities warrant more rates. Get the basics right, water and sewage!

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I do not think we should be selling assets unless it is to directly buy different ones. You are robbing future generations.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop redeveloping elaborate playgrounds, unless play equipment is unsafe or needs replacing, no need to create Disneyland playgrounds costing millions of dollars.



Stop painting colours all over roads and putting planters everywhere.

Stop creating 30km zones, this speed is far too slow except for immediately outside schools. Any slower speeds should be 40kms.

Have much more oversight of the work that contractors do to ensure getting value for money. Why do cones and barriers remain in place for weeks and weeks after the work is finished? Why do projects that used to be done by Council workers now cost tens, even hundreds of thousands more when done by contractors.

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Unsure how safe dynamic lanes would be in some situations, Imagine there would be limited areas where these can be successfully implemented.

It will never be possible to get on top of traffic congestion as long as immigration remains high and there are car transport ships in port almost every day disgorging cars.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Smaller buses for routes where there are never very many passengers, eg Devonport's 807 and 806.

Why are there always buses driving around with signs 'Not in service' or 'we are kinetic'?

Sorting out the Auckland Transport online website so that it is understandable. I can easily understand transport info overseas but even though I live in Auckland I can never get simple direct information from the AT website. When I want to get from A to B I need to know addresses or landmarks, not bus stop numbers, that is meaningless. I also don't need to be told to walk 50 mtrs to the stop. I know where I want to catch the bus and how I am going to get to that point, I don't need to be told to walk some metres from some imaginary starting point. It is all too confusing. I just need to know where the bus stop is (not by number) by location, and where I can get off, again by location.



## 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Contractors! How many times do we see them doing a job and then coming back within a few weeks to 'fix it up' or redo it? Even while they are in the middle of the project we residents can see the mistakes they are making and predict with accuracy that they will be back soon to fix it.

Contractors are costing far too much money. If there was more control over contractors and less money wastage then rates would not have to go up and services would not have to be cut.

I asked a road management crew why there were so many orange cones stretching way down the road in both directions on either side of a very small job. I was told that Council decides how many cones must be used. If this is correct then Council is being far too cautious in requiring so many cones, people do have commonsense, they don't need to be guided by cones half a km before they get to the roadworks. On that occasion there were no contractors in sight but the stop-go people said they still had to be there!

In years past when Council workers did this work there were never such elaborate traffic control measures and everything worked fine. There are huge costs associated with every project big or small which are really unnecessary.

And many times where a project requires 3 services; water, power, other services, the road is dug up, resealed, then a couple of weeks later the next service comes along and re-digs it all up and fills it in, then a few weeks later the 3rd service comes along and digs it all up again! Why can't they coordinate?

Also, why does every project take weeks and usually months. Cones, barriers, big metal plates on the roads remain that way for weeks and months, what is this costing? Why can't the projects be done quickly and efficiently?

Spend nothing on the Big Gay Out. Why is there a Big Gay Out funded by ratepayers? The original purpose of this parade no longer applies, even though it was always a parade where people would dress skimpily and make pornographic moves in public whereas a heterosexual parade where people did the same thing would not be acceptable. This parade has been hijacked by fringe groups with an agenda and even gay and lesbians are not ok with much of it. Why should this sex celebration party, based around the sexual preferences and perversions of a few people, be funded when for example there is no less reason to fund that boobs on bikes parade through the city with topless girls on motorbikes. I can see no difference.

Spend less on 'targeted climate change' initiatives. Instead call it what it is, poor maintenance of drains and waterways, lack of clearing drains and streams, and also allowing buildings to be put where they shouldn't have been allowed in the first place.



Just get back to basic Council services of maintaining drains and waterways and half the 'climate change' issues wouldn't exist. As well, stop filling the city with people when the infrastructure can't cope. The drains cannot take all the extra water, sewage and stormwater generated by more and more houses and when more and more land is being covered with buildings and asphalt - this is the cause of flooding, not climate change.

### 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

#### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Depending on how the fund is managed and the cost to ratepayers eg; another CCO suggests more high costs.

Where would the \$2.1 billion come from? That suggests to me it would be foreign borrowing. We don't want foreign entities to have more of a stranglehold on our assets.

Why isn't POA already paying good dividends?

There are plenty of wasteful services and spending that can be cut.

#### 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



If the port was leased then does that put the ports operation at risk of being sold to overseas owners?

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

If the money is used of services it will just disappear down a black hole and we will not have much more to show for it. Council is very good at wasting money instead of sticking to the basics.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

The only way I can see where the Council would make a profit from these areas would be to sell them for apartments. I would not like to see apartments on these wharves. Firstly because it would take away any opportunity to make the area a recreational a

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Because I do not trust Council to make good use of the land, I suspect it would be sold for apartments.



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#650



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

What is - • implement priority actions from the Devonport-Takapuna Ethnic Plan??

What is - • support initiatives promoting inclusion, diversity and expression of culture

These are just buzz words with no specific direct meaning.

Why does Achilles Reserve need an upgraded playground? Why do Council/Local Boards keep pouring millions into new playgrounds which require major engineering works. The play equipment at Achilles Park is quite adequate, there is nothing wrong with it. It is a tiny reserve and probably few children in the area use the play equipment. Did children ask for new equipment? No, it is adults who think it would be nice for them to have new equipment. Most playground equipment that is unnecessarily replaced is in good order and may be dated but these playgrounds are for small children and they are happy with whatever is there. A swing and slide is usually all they need to be happy. Let them use their imaginations. They don't need the equivalent of Disney-worlds everywhere. This is a waste of money - again.



**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

What is - • support initiatives promoting inclusion, diversity and expression of culture?? Just throwing in these virtue-signalling terms because they are fashionable and people feel they 'ought' to do it. What exactly does this mean and how does it translate in the way ratepayer money is spent?

What is - • invest in initiatives that build community networks and resilience? This is such a broad statement it could mean anything!

How is Lake Road going to be upgraded? This is in the plans every ten years but nothing changes except that more and more infill housing and a huge retirement village have put enormous and increasing pressure on Lake Road so that it is almost at a standstill at all times of the day.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Please stop wasting money on new playgrounds and virtue-signalling 'events.' Show respect for where this money comes from, for those on fixed incomes/pensions, increases in rates means lower standards of living for individuals - something has to be cut whether it is heating or food or social connections.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I think its important to continue to develop cycleways, giving the community alternative ways to commute.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Making public transport cost effective for the users, reliable and easy to use.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Road improvements that don't directly improve public transport options.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

Stadiums should serve the community. If a majority of the time the stadium is not in use it is not a useful asset to the community.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:

### 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

It is important to ensure the council does not lose out in long term gains by making short term profits.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#651



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#651



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#693



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Fairly Important



#693



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#729



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important



#729



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Not prepared to pay more do what Brown got elected to do reduce number of staff and use of too expensive consultants

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

No need to spend taxpayer money on cycle ways and rapid transport( that still ignores transport between suburbs)

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Reducing the number of ineffective councillors and staff/management

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Staff, management and councillors

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is,Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

It is good enough

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### Tell us why:

Council needs to retain its investments



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Any payments/ income received should be used to reduce debt as promised by Brown

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Auckland future fund will require additional resources and funding which should be a no-no for all council activities

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

No more additional costs to be borne by ratepayers

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#740



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#740



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide	Fairly Important



#740



decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Not being able to swim at our beaches is a travesty and really would like council to Focus on delivery of basic services. Additionally control unaccountable out of control Dixie’s like AT

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Stop Wasting money in crazy things like \$500k pedestrian crossings

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Common sense really

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Value will grow over time and once sold they're gone

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other



**Tell us here:**

Mixed ownership is likely to get a better return

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Have to put something aside

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Only city in the world where prime land is used to park imported cars

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

As above



#751



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#751



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Need to focus on basics

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Focus on basics

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

investments in new roads and expensive roads. we should be thinking longer term and investing in footpath/ public transport/ cycling routes to enable easier transport and less reliance on cars.



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

cycling and pedestrian safety are critical and should be enabled over car usage.

Auckland central should be as restrictive as London. Similarly, I do not support a weekly cap on public transport fees.

## 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

cycling ways and making public transport easier so it is the default choice.

## 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

new roads

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

### Tell us why:

I don't know about the usage and area enough to comment, overall I am ambivalent to this proposal. However it makes sense to maximise the use of the facility & area.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:



seems sensible to take the investments in to a 3rd party arrangement so best decision can be make without any political wrangling.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

not sure, both options are presented as factual outcomes when in reality they are based on a series of assumptions. Either way the land should be retained by council.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

opportunity to maximse the profits

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

even if the land is transferred, it isn't a desirable area to go - it would be between a busy ferry terminal & operating port.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

as above. the whole area isn't a desirable destination, seems like a waste of money.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing</p>	<p>Other</p>



#779



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#779



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I would only be prepared to support extra spending if it was efficient. Council is over staffed and no-one seems to pay any attention to value for money. A local crossing in Devonport was raised at a cost of over \$539k - when it is barely used. There were seven other crossings raised in Devonport for seemingly marginal benefit. This is just one example of council waste



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Reduce headcount dramatically, and cut waste and senseless programs.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I support cutting waste such as \$500k raised crossings and endless spending on traffic management. But a broom is needed to get rid of the people at AT who have delivered crazy spending over the past 6-9 years.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised crossings, salaries, consultants, offices, etc

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Contract someone to operate it. Council staff have no idea.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



Council offers no value to AIA, and didn't participate in the capital raising in 2021 which diluted council's share-holding, and meant ratepayers lost value.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

POA has been an absolute disaster for Auckland. Extra costs of over \$400m were inflicted on importers and exporters during the failed automation project. The only way POA can pay a dividend is to levy a surcharge on importers and exporters. The key productivity stats of crane rates and lifts per hour are woeful compared to Port of Tauranga. The 3 "super cranes" are still hardly ever used after 3 years.

Council has no expertise as all in managing the Port of Auckland and it has been an abject failure. Take the ground rental and a fee per container handled - as ports do in Australia.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Council has proven comprehensively that it cannot operate the port effectively. The comparison in;- dividends, volumes handled, efficiency, accidents, enterprise value between Port of Tauranga and Auckland is very clear evidence that Council's ownership has been a financial disaster. NB This does not include the hundreds of millions of extra costs inflicted on exporters and importers due to the botched automation project - when they were charged USD215 (and more) per 20 foot containers by shipping lines to compensate for extra costs caused by the automation failure..

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



**Tell us here:**

Council must not operate the port - as above.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Not enough information provided

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Not enough information provided

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#786



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Council cannot do enough efficiently. These proposals are people heavy and value light. Just more overheads, talk and consultants. Council does not seem to be able to take a common-sense, balanced approach to scope and/or spending.



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important



#786



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Not Important

**Tell us why**

These proposals just mean more overpaid staff, more meetings and more consultation - with inevitable poor quality delivery.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Answers looking for questions that don't exist.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Give local events away, encourage commercial engagement.

Councils job is to simply to look after infrastructure.



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Government is about to embark on funding better infrastructure.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#809



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p></p>



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Not Important



#809



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

reduce emissions and cars on the road either by improving public transport of encouraging cycling and EV's

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



road works

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I am unhappy about cutting the regional fuel tax as this is a great way to generate revenue and discourage use of petrol cars

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

cycling and cheaper public transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

roads

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Money is better spent in reducing rates

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

not sure if this will save any money



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

leasing might help generate greater income and efficiency

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

this might help to reduce our rates

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

income is needed for the city and keeping rates down

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#875



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide	Fairly Important



#875



decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

community building is very important

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

cyclists rarely obey the laws or consider other road users

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

public transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

roads

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

a slush fund can be easily raided

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



**Tell us here:**

likelihood of foreign owners not acting in our best interests (like the bus services)

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#892



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Do not support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know



#892



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Fairly Important



#892



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No spending on social programs and tourism



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

TA have overseen a period of poor investment and waste. It has to stop

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycleways. Pedestrian crossings ( paint is ok)

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#895



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Not Important



#895



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): All Nations Mission Centre

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I wish there was additional support for increasing the number of medical personnel.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

doesn't exist.



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think it's appropriate.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

doesn't exist

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

doesn't exist

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

I want to keep it current

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

great

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

doesn't exist

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#898



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

no

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	



#898



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Most people support proceeding sequentially.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Would prefer a strong focus on public transport

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Roads

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#905



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Very Important



#905



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It sounds like the best plan

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

It is pointless to dispose of this great community asset.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Sounds like the best moderate plan.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Gain of revenue and efficient management.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

We must think to the future.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Hopefully benefit will be gained in the public's interest.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



**Tell us why:**

Long term benefit to the public.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
--	----------------



#922



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Community assets and relationships are fundamental to community health.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Sensible.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

No



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Back to basics is good. Less fancy stuff

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Other

**Tell us why:**

Needs to be considered within wider Auckland stadium needs and providing amenity to large North Shore population

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Makes sense as Fund will have more flexibility to appropriately sell concentrated shares that are non-strategic in timely matter, rather than in response to urgent event

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Self Insurance may be risky for Auckland as it is a concentrated risk that insurers may be more well placed to diversify and therefore cost less. Increase in excess may be appropriate through self insurance of a basic level.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#977



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#977



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#977



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Better bike paths that are separated for effective safe cycle transport options. Better composting and recycling services for future proofing.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Less highways and toll roads to beaches

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Maintain efforts to increase cycle and pedestrian access that is safe. E-bikes and scooters will be taken up better if they're safe.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycle lanes that are separated.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Strong environmental policies and oversight required if leasing ports and wharves.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Auckland is a climate crisis in waiting

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#985



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

As a destination Takapuna and Devonport suffer with increased visitor populations so improvement of facilities would be helpful to maximize visitor capacity. Rubbish bins, clean up and events for these visitors are important. Iwi consultation could only improve on our climate initiatives in the area and making the space less of a European privilege bubble

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Fine. I think a focus on bike lanes, public transport and climate future proofing would be valuable. Playgrounds also good.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Traffic is choking Auckland to death, both in terms of people's time lost and in terms of pollution.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I think the plan for a \$50/week ticket and enabling paywave are great ideas.

An annual pass is also a great idea -- I've lived in germany where rail transport can be subsidised annually and this works very well (bahncard.de)

We need more alternative transport options to get cars off the roads (public transport, rail, support for cycling).

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:



Excellent Idea.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

We need to keep assets, but long term thinking needs to be towards recapturing the use of our waterfront for people rather than cargo.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



**Tell us why:**

We need to have more access to the amazing waterfront but I don't want this to come at a massive increase in traffic.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#989



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#989



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Water quality network and stoppi g the sewage flow to the sea. Making sure our water network is solid for years to come.

Cbd congestion charge

Traffic flow improvements



#1031



More ferries across existing and new destinations.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Unnecessary crossing improvements. Especially the ones that then require storm run off changes which then need additional costly expense to consent, begin and build.

Less reliance on expensive outside consultants.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Auckland is built in such a way that means a car or some form of road transport is entirely necessary. We have a high car ownership in Auckland. That does need changing but in the meantime it needs help and then we can consider re using lanes in the future for other forms of transport.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

We need dedicated bike routes. Cars are expensive but an electric bike can get you to your destination faster than a bus.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Building the infrastructure for housing estates outside of Auckland.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**



**#1031**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#1031



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#1031



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#1031



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

This looks like a list of stuff that somehow got through from a bigger list that nobody could agree on.

Housing intensity is being increased, which is great, but without thought of the infrastructure that should go along with it. Additional options to connect takapuna and Devonport to the highways. Bus lane along Lake Road.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

They are not solving the things that really need looking at.



**#1031**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#1033**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Not enough investment in public transport

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

public transport: more bus lanes, more priority to buses, no road parking in bus routes, T2/T3 lanes,...

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

reduce cost

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**



#1033



lease and lessen the rates

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#1033



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#1033



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important



#1033



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

prefer less spending

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improved Public Transport infrastructure and bus services capacity.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1037**



Remove the food compost service

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need to fund alternatives to using a car. Public Transport is really important to me.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More on Public Transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Less on food scraps and compost services

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

More work on getting more sports events and music events should be done.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



**#1037**



I am concerned that this is proposing more of what we already have (Airport shares etc)

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

I think steps should be taken to relocate the port?

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Alternative funding sources should be used to provide cheaper and easier to use Public Transport

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

This is very valuable real estate that the people of Aucklanders should have access to



#1037



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

This could be redeveloped into a really cool public space

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	



#1037



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#1037



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Not so concerned about cultural work, but very interested in seeing some transport related projects get up and running. Like

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#1061**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#1061



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#1061



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Do not support



**#1061**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

We would never spend anywhere near what you propose for the targeted rate for rubbish collection. We are already targeted for the food scraps bin which we don't use. It should be "pay for what you use".

To be quite honest the more rates we pay the more that will be wasted. This pulling out beautiful non native trees and replacing with native ones is vandalism. The so called beautification of Takapuna is a disaster and the removal of the central car park means we won't be using the local restaurants or picture theatre once it is closed. The parking building is too far away and dangerous after dark.

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Infrastructure

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1071**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#1071



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#1071



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#1071



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important



#1071



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Focus should be on delivering better local infrastructure rather than engineering societal attitudes

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1119**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#1119



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#1119



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#1119



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important



#1119



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

reduce road maintenance crews to essential numbers. Currently too many standing/sitting engaged on their 'phones. Includes sitting in trucks on 'phones.



**#1130**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I am of the opinion that Auckland Council has drifted for years whilst wasting ratepayer revenue. We need to have a dynamic city achieved through wise thought-out expenditures. Basically, council can achieve much whilst living within budgetary disciplines. Wayne Brown is a breath of fresh application to the job.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

We do not currently have that opportunity. Parsimonious application must be the way forward.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Yes, employee numbers, many are surplus to requirements. Remove free parking and other perks from some staff and employ senior staff members who are prepared to work for generous but not outrageous salaries e.g. the CEO package.

Put the Tūpuna Maunga Authority under a microscope. I understand they are awarded \$118million over 10 years to achieve what exactly?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

### Tell us why:

I simply do not have enough knowledge to comment.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



**#1130**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I am not keen on selling airport shares. Once gone, money spent, what next?

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Just make it profitable as is the case for Ports of Tauranga. God almighty, we have enough high paid individuals on council and the ports, surely there is enough nouse to achieve this. If not make way for others who can get this done.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Our rates should bear relativity to inflation. They do not and have not done so for years.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know



#1130



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#1130



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Sorry, I am not sufficiently aware of some issues to comment.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I don't know



#1130



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	I don't know
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	I don't know
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	I don't know
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	I don't know
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Take better care of the environment -for example, drains and curbs are no longer cleared - then with heavy rain the system becomes blocked. Preventative care for long-term benefit and lower costs.



**#1136**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less emphasis on under utilised cycle lanes, fewer speed bumps in roads (that cause extra pollution and fuel waste)

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stop increasing traffic congestion by reducing the amount of roading the majority of transport can use.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase public transport while also making all city and urban public transport free for all. It is currently vastly under utilised.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Wasteful eco and useless objects placed on roads to prevent through-flow of traffic. Stop painting objects on city roads.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

There are more important other ways to spend the available funds.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#1136**



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

It does not add up.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Preferably to keep port in council hands.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**



#1136



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#1136



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#1136



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

General rubbish collection programme is absurd and increasing costs to rate payers. Council is having to employ extra staff to remove collection pay stickers from bins, these also need to be printed and disposed of. More efficient and less costly to implement an additional annual rate charge.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

To maintain and improve core services.

To improve life and services for elderly. After all they have paid rates longer.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1166**



Monitor Auckland transport activities, No more cycle lanes no more raised pedestrian crossings. An absolute waste of money. Get the cones required for jobs reduced by at least half.

Dont put on expensive Events. They should be self funding.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Reign Auckland transport in. They are funded by our rates and are very unapproachable. I live in Devonport and over the past 18 months they have made a dogs breakfast of our roads. So much unnecessary work has been done. the supposed improvements are in some instants more of a hazard than before. It will be interesting to see where ALL the rain waterdown the main road goes to if we have another cyclone.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Improving trafficking managment along Lake road Devonport. Somethime we are prisoners in Devonport. Remove the bke lanes and make it 2 lane. Put bike lanes on secondary roads.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

New Bike lanes. New pedestrians crossings expecially raised ones.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

### **Tell us why:**

Sell it it is a cost we cannot afford.



**#1166**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Sell a part of the shares but not all. Council needs to retain a say in the airport. But the airport is a dogs breakfast at the moment. Management of the airport need to be reviewed. The airport is the face of auckland nvery poor one at the moment.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Council needs to have a say in how the port is run.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Needs to stay with council

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#1166



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

It would require the council to spend money they dont have to provide a public benifit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

as 5A

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#1166



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna



#1166



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

#### Tell us why

Achillies reserve playground should just be maintained not renewed. It is a small park away from a big population.



**#1166**



Supporting the Art partners is a nice to do but not a essential service

with the cost of living crisis events should be kept to a minimum. Devonports roads are closed/restricted for quite a few weekends of the year. It caused inconvenience to the residents. Not to mention how much traffic management costs. No one asks the residents if they are happy to have restricted movement round the village to cater for people from out of the area.

The board should concentrate on core values

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Not much

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Long term investments (i.e., roads, transport) rather than just short tem easy fixes.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1167**



Less social and environmental investments for now. we need to get our acts together on basic stuff first like transport, infrastructure, etc.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need long-term transport planning. We are so behind other major cities in the OECD. It is embarrassing!

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Long term transport!

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

not essential right now.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Long term investment on infrastructure is needed sooner than later.



**#1167**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

any revenue to invest in long-term objectives is a positive.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

invest in long-term objectives is a positive.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Keep it as is until you retain the full land of the port. This is just a piece meal investment with no clarity on the long-term view of that port land.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know



#1167



**Tell us why:**

Keep it as is until you retain the full land of the port. This is just a piece meal investment with no clarity on the long-term view of that port land.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1167



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna,Rodney

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#1167



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Rodney Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#1167



Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Very Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	Not Important
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	Very Important
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	Not Important
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Not Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Not Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	Not Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#1167**



As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#1182



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think it is shortsighted not to continue with cycleways. If our roads were safer for cyclists more people would consider biking around. I fall in this category - I currently think it is unsafe to cycle in my neighbourhood.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Before spending on redevelopment, I think it would be worth seeing if it is used more by changing the operational management first. If it is still underutilised at that point, a redevelopment could be considered. It seems unnecessary to redevelop as a first step.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#1182



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Half and half. Seems like a wise way to manage a budget. It doesn't need to be all or nothing. A bit like how we teach kids to manage money - one third spend, one third save, one third donate.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#1182



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#1182



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	I don't know
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Very Important



#1182



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#1189**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#1189



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#1189



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#1189**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1226



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

social services

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#1226



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

council is inefficient in it's operations

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#1226



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Do not support



#1226



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important



#1226



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

water, public transport, cultural life

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1254**



speed bumps

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#1254



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#1254



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#1254



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Very Important



#1254



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Managing stormwater and sewage systems.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1277



Cycleways and less traffic light systems for cyclists and pedestrians. Much less bumps at pedestrian crossings and speed bumps.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

All it does is reduce productivity.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No cycleways.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

This is a community facility that should be used by all, where possible.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#1277



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Do not support



#1277



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1277



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Not Important



#1277



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Consider alternative rate base structure to capture benefits by users of all Auckland facilities such as parking, access to beaches, boating etc. Perhaps the Council should go all the way (and as in some US states: <http://www.virginiaplaces.org/taxes/propincome.html> ) and increase the rates base by



#1288



including cars, boats and other accoutrements of the NIMBYs who are prone to hang on to what they have.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Look for cheaper alternatives to bus services that are rarely used - e.g. in Devonport

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Not enough budget for bikes and interconnecting walkways

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Bikes and interconnecting walkways to enable children to walk to school

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

excessive health and safety procedures where there is limited traffic

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Encourage North Shore Rugby and other sports entities to move from Devonport to Albany to reduce traffic on Lake Road

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#1288**



**Tell us why:**

To enable greater regulation of major assets like Auckland Airport and Ports without concerns over conflicts of interest; and to sell off many other smaller other Punuku assets such that are not being efficiently used

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

To reduce Ports footprint by selling off surplus surrounding land

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Council services should be funded by the ratepayers who use them

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#1288



These assets are only being used to import and store motor vehicles which could be located at Wiri.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Force the Port to look at moving elsewhere

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Support



#1288



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Consider alternative rate base structure to capture benefits by users of all Auckland facilities such as parking, access to beaches, boating etc. Perhaps the Council should go all the way (and as in some US states: <http://www.virginiaplaces.org/taxes/propincome.html> ) and increase the rates base by including cars, boats and other accoutrements of the NIMBYs who are prone to hang on to what they have.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna



#1288



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

#### Tell us why



**#1288**



**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

More emphasis should be given to providing alternatives routes for walkers - particularly school children and bicycles to avoid having to use Lake road

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Devonport beachfront owners should be incentive to sell their assets to multistory developers



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#1325**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Non-automobile transport options should be highly prioritised.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Foreign ownership of critical transport infrastructure has never been a great financial success.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#1325



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

A central port operations zone is handy to have after a natural disaster.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#1325



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#1325



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important



#1325



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

The parks are under utilised and Council can do nothing to improve matters.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Make all Auckland general rubbish collections rate funded and not have some requiring tags and some not. Make public transport (including ferries) much better. Improve shameful/ embarrassing infrastructure.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1345**



Wasteful spending on unpopular initiatives - eg organic food scrap collections, and obsession with bus /ferry service IT but having the services not running properly, with high costs and poor timetabling.(make connections with other modes improved and should be 1 hour)

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

More and better public transport needed urgently / removal of bike lanes which are very dangerous and barely used

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport, infrastructure, road improvements, footpath improvements, improved cleaning /hygiene on public transport (plastic seat covers not fabric) and in public toilets and other public areas.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Organic food waste collections and cycle ways. Badly placed signage and road cones.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### **Tell us why:**

Auckland council has a bad reputaton for making bad development decsions eg rip it down now then regret it in a few years. The whole place looks shoddy - the new city council buiding looks dirty, cheap and nasty and embarrassingly has no green around it.



**#1345**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Too much money wasted on poor initiatives eg organic food waste collection - the small bins blow around everywhere. There is a general ignorance displayed about carbon emissions and future outcomes due.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Move the ports away to a more practical place and improve port side amenity. The place looks ugly.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Move ports out of Waitemata

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Move ports out of Waitemata.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#1345



Other

**Tell us why:**

Improve berthing areas for overseas ships - away from local ferry areas. Its a big mess currently.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#1345



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Maybe some of your information is complicated and may take a long time to look at. People are wondering why you cannot sort it out - you get paid too.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna



#1345



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	I don't know
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	I don't know
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	I don't know
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	I don't know

Tell us why



**#1345**



People want the toilets / changing rooms cleaned properly and currently they are not. These buildings also need repairs. Check the dogs on beaches rules - where are the inspectors for this. I did not see one all summer and the dogs were running a muck on the beaches all day. How about getting the bus / ferry timetables working properly so they connect properly. Just some basic measures such as these would go a long way - not so important are the amazing and trendy ones.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Remove cycle ways. Improve transport flow for Lake Rd. Get the dog rules for beaches looked at (winter does not start in March? as the dog signs say). Improve bus / ferry connections and costs

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

the council is already doing less and rate payers are paying more.



**#1372**



so, the question is do we as rate payers have confident in what the council say, but unfortunately, we have to pay the rates.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

because we are wasting our time with these surveys. Council only find ways to increase what we pay with less services

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**



#1372



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	



#1372



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#1372**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Just focus on making Council work more efficiently and enough wasting the Rate payers money, STOP the Council's Bureaucracy which is causing to get less services standards. I really hope this government will do something about the council level/standards of services and limit the Bureaucracy, as enough is enough



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Yes, get rid of Auckland Transport. AT needs to be reigned in and merged back into the council. Focus on core services



#1375



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I do not support:

making public transport faster, more reliable and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay and introducing capped weekly public transport passes

network optimisation, reducing temporary traffic management requirements and introducing dynamic lanes

I support:

stopping some previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Yes, spend more on getting rid of AT

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Yes, Auckland Transport

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

The North Shore has been lacking in the right investment (current investment has been in all the wrong areas (we didn't need 3+ pedestrian crossings within a few hundred metres of each other (as an example of wasteful spending)).

We need more investment in the Stadium, with promotion for it's use.



**#1375**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#1375



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#1375



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#1375



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#1385**



Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Keep the fuel tax and use it towards Auckland's development. If it means amending the fuel tax legislation to do this, then it still should be considered. The tax is being collected and people are used to it. The tolls on the harbour bridge were removed, but could have been kept and helped pay for its upkeep or towards another harbour bridge crossing.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

the stadium should be a wonderful venue and used so much more than it is.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Keep the Airport shares

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#1385**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Keep the Ports of Auckland and improve the income by better management of the Ports of Auckland.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

The use of funds can go towards coastal, harbour maintenance and improvement as well as towards a new harbour crossing.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Unless there is a sensible suggestion on the use of the land, leaving it as part of port operations.

Trying to gather crowds of people into that area does not make sense as there is no realistic parking around the area and the buses, trains, ferries are

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#1385



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Keep the terminal for Port of Auckland operations. Again transferring it for 'something else' must be for a valid reason or need, which has not been made clear.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in	Do not support



#1385



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#1385



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

The Takapuna Library serves a large community - what is the explanation for 'redeveloping' it? the saying 'If it is not broken why fix it' comes to mind. I do not support a redeveloped library / community hub.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Do not support the proposed priorities for the 10 year budget



**#1385**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

10 year plan in principle is acceptable, but for example why revisit the library/community hub project in 2024/5 term?. What is the reasoning behind this project? If it is to sell the land to gather more income and therefore reduce the library size to also include a community hub, how does this promote the ten year key priority to "invest in initiatives that build community networks and resilience"? It seems to be making a mockery of that key priority.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No, absolutely not. The council is a gigantic woke parasite feasting on its host until it kills it.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1398**



Less funding of public transport. If public transport requires any subsidy to survive then it doesn't work and should be abandoned. No public funds should be allocated to any public transport initiative except perhaps new and better roads but even then council cannot be trusted to do anything competently. Any public transport business (whoever owns it) must pay market rates to rate payers for using any taxpayer funded infrastructure i.e. bus lanes, cycle lanes, bridges, shelters etc. Stop installation of raised crossings and remove those already installed. Install smart traffic lights to allow traffic to flow.

Council must extricate itself from any direct involvement in funding/running/promoting non-core council functions.

Close down Auckland transport and eliminate all staffing positions.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Tax/rate payer funded public transport simply does not and cannot work. It can never be cost effective or even convenient. There may be roles for special point-to-point services for specific routes at specific times but it should be up to a private enterprise operator, at their own risk, to fill such perceived market gaps.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No. Councils have demonstrated time and time again they cannot be trusted with spending public funds wisely.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

All non-core council activities should be eliminated. For the record core activities include things such as water, sewage, efficient roads, parks and reserves. Libraries should all be privatised and closed as times have moved on, its after the information age. Spending by council on public transport is a gigantic fiscal black hole akin to burning rate payer funds. The destruction/theft of the roads we rate payers previously paid is an outrage and an abuse of rate payers funds. The installation of raised



**#1398**



crossings, road islands, bus lanes, cycle lanes are evidence of out of touch council spending of someone else's money.

### **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

#### **Tell us why:**

The council should not run or operate anything. Sell/lease out all assets (stadiums, swimming pools, theatres etc) to commercial enterprises to run them appropriately.

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

#### **Tell us why:**

The council should not own or operate anything. All assets owned by the council should be sold to offset the councils' enormous debts. The reduction in interest costs would allow rates to be reduced not increased.

### **4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

#### **Tell us here:**

Sell port assets outright and use the funds to defray debt.

### **4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other



#1398



**Tell us here:**

Should the council continue to run the port it will be a miracle if the port ever makes a profit to pay a dividend but if it did then dividends should be used to reduce rates.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No to a future fund. Yes to self insurance.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Council has demonstrated time and time again it cannot run anything effectively so should be barred from here on in even trying. The port should be leased/sold to a competent operator.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Council has demonstrated time and time again it cannot run anything effectively so should be barred from here on in even trying. The port should be leased/sold to a competent operator.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#1398



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Other
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Do not support



#1398



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Water and sewage are core council services and should be the council primary focus and should be collectively funded accordingly.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Table with 2 columns: Priority description and Response. Rows include: Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna; Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan; Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan; Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka.



#1398



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

None of these are important or can be remotely considered to be core priorities. I am extremely disappointed that the local board even proposed them.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Basically, the whole plan sucks and should be relegated to the rubbish bin. The local board should in good conscious tender their resignations on mass as clearly the job they were elected to do is beyond them.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

The council is an unwieldy woke self sustaining bureaucracy which sucks up other peoples hard earned cash whilst providing zero return and ignoring its basic services duties. In most cases the council just makes living in Auckland harder and more difficult.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#1399**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Auckland needs to move. This plan sounds sensible.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

The residents who use the stadium would have a better understanding of what is needed

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#1399



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

To have a bird in your hand is better than to "have" two birds flying

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#1399



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	I don't know
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#1399



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important



#1399



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I would prefer to keep the library and its many rooms and halls. I do not see the need for a new building, just some reorganization would do. Facilitating the use of the rooms with a better venue hire service that allows people to book for the entire year with the aid of a human being would also be amazing.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Support cycleways and public transport

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1415**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More on public transport, bus lanes, Cycleways

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Don't sell airport shares

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#1415



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

Develop cruise ship terminal separate from commuter ferry terminal

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#1415



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#1415



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important



#1415



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Parks restoration and maintenance

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#1420**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

We need to get going again. Central government is to tax petrol more. Why can't we recover GST and a portion of the fuel tax levy from Central Govt?

A tax on cyclists should be considered to cover the costs of cycle ways, they make no direct contribution for the use of presently. Alternatively reserve one footpath on the side of each road for sole use of cycles, scooters, mobile devices, the other side reserved solely for pedestrians.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

speed bumps, go back to the tried-and-true painted lines but maintain them adequately.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

Let us try to get the precinct back into shape first with a fresh management approach, if that fails then revert to consideration of redeveloping the area into a more updated precinct as once lost it will never be recovered, it has potential.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



**#1420**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We are strangled now, a bold plan to get us moving again, and restoring Ak to a viable future.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Put the onus on those in business to get the Port viable and efficient; Council still has ultimate control over the asset.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

That is the purpose of the exercise, and it is being monitored and reported on annually through investment.,

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

None other than we are placing a lot of trust in Council doing this - get it right please!

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#1420



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Wharf areas are precious to Aucklanders and visitors they should be public spaces to be enjoyed by the public, not cluttered up by residential apartments, or stadiums or similar, just a good space for public enjoyment. With suitable amenities and good a

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

As previous opined.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1420



Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No



#1420



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important



#1420



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Steady as she goes, let's get organised to complete what is important and maintain current contacts in other areas such as ethnic.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It does not look that inspiring but if those are the choices I will have to concede they "may know best".

Hopefully the local board will have greater say in matters pertaining to their role and be heeded by the likes of AT if they make a recommendation etc.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Best of good fortune in bring Auckland back to its rightful place as the best place in NZ, you just have to look at it on any day to know we live in paradise, and I want to leave it as best as I can for those that will be fortunate enough to follow and live in this marvellous city (country). But there is work to do and obstacles to overcome.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Expansion of public transportation (=especially expansion of city bus routes) is necessary.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1425**



Sports, Recreation and Community Services

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Funding is provided to expand bus services and transportation networks, a means of public transportation.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#1425



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	
---	--



#1425



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	



**#1425**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



**#1507**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

If raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways are improving safety, they should be done.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cannot see strategic benefit of the AA shareholding and it is otherwise a lousy investment strategy to tie up all that money in one asset.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#1507**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#1507



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#1507



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#1507



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1523**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

White elephant that was forced on the nsc by the nzrfu

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#1523



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#1523



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1523



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Not Important



#1523



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

All households should pay one rate charge not just tax people who live in more affluent area to subsidise the poorest households user pays



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Cycleways, Bus Lanes, TOD

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1529**



cheaper delivery of transport infrastructure through compromise and choosing good over great if makes sense to do so.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Keep cycleway funding.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycleways / bus lanes / traffic enforcement

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Just ensure BCR is good for all projects regardless of type.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Not needed stadium. Can be used in prime location next to Albany bus station.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#1529**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#1529



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#1529



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#1529



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Need budget for Esmonde road to Franklin road link.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Please don't fall for the trap of thinking cycleways aren't good bang for buck transport projects.

I'm 22 young, student and tax payer we need a 21st century holistic transport agenda to improve our city for everyone including car drivers. It is possible it just takes the political will.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Remove the focus on better outcomes for Maori. Treat all aucklanders equally



**#1530**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We don't need easier payment options or capped weekly payments. AT Hop card is fine

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Nope

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycle lanes

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Sell it, it is never used

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#1530



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Do not support



#1530



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know



#1530



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	I don't know
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Not Important



#1530



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#1536**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycleways should be retained to reduce traffic.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

AIAL shareholding should be retained.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#1536



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#1536



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1536



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Fairly Important



#1536



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#1559**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

There's no parking at the bus stations so public transport is a waste of money , raised crossings at traffic lights is a waste of money

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Wider roads as with all the extra housing the roads are all becoming one way

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#1559



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#1559



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1559



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Fairly Important



#1559



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

## Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of ‘fit for purpose’ local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	



#1559



Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I do not support most priorities

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

Fairly Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Not Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Not Important



#1559



Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Not Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do less
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Electric trains out to Hellensvill.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1583**



Cultural red tape.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Cycle way all good. Raised P. crossings is waist and pedestreians don't use them more often just because they are raised

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

1. Cycle way all good.
2. Having a faster reliable transport system.
3. One ticketing system OR eftpos / pay wave cards for all means of transport
4. Trans out to Air port and Hellenvill

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

1. Raised P. crossings is waist and pedestrians don't use them more just because they are raised.
2. Traffic cones

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

Very under utilized. But a great venue and good location. Not worth pulling down or redeveloping. It would only cores more loss of fields , carparking and open spaces.



#1583



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

1. At this current time moving money around is risky.
2. Having it in a fund controlled by the Council is open to radical spending. or the "Flavor of the day". locked in shares, all be it they to are risky, give clear guidelines and a regular source of funds. Also in time AIA will be the hub of the Pacific. Why sell now???

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Yes retain the ownership or the Ports and wharves but improve the facilities and services and infrastructures so more cruse ships can come in and be able to accommodate two or three at a time. Without disruption to Freight shipping.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Upgrading the Ports as above

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#1583



Don't like the idea of a Future Fund.

The Ports and water fronts could be upgraded to host major events. Power boat racing all forms of Yacht racing, Dragon boat racing, Major concerts. Olympic games events.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

These would be good to turn into better Cruse Ship terminal and link a train/ tram/ Mono rail to.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

It's only used to land cars. Waisted space. If there is a train system that can take all the cargo NOT TRUCKS, then go for it. If not best left as terminal to off load goods.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#1583



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#1583



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

More resources should be put into the use / reuse of rubbish.

I'm told a traffic cone cost around \$40 ea. Why can't these be made from recycled plastics? at a fraction of the cost. Not enough thought is being put into what we could be doing with the waist we create. Don't wait for the government, just do it, lead the way. Other councils are struggling also. Lead!!!

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important



#1583



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Sounds like it's a lick of paint.

We are surrounded by beaches but can't get to them because the carparks a chockers and no bus service to get you there. Except Long Bay.

Ethnic plans create more bureaucracy and division.

We need a 2nd HB crossing!!!

It is time for the Navy to move out of Devonport. It could be another major attraction.

Takapuna had a Library, why did it close???

If the bus system is the only way, why not electrify all the busses.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Hard to understand

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Have noticed the parks and gardens are now being mowed and looked after more often. They are also not blowing the clippings into the gutter. Makes a difference.

Keep up the good work.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Upgrade ferries and infrastructure

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cease development cycle esys



**#1585**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Only proceed as funding provided

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Must progress when profitable

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#1585



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#1585



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1585



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Not Important



#1585



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Invest in public transport network and more community spaces

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1625**



Sell golf courses

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

- I support making public transport faster and making it easier to pay (yes please!!)
- I agree with dynamic lanes
- I do not support stopping progress on raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Even more on public transport, and more on creating safe cycleways - not just for cyclists but kids on bikes!

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

### **Tell us why:**



**#1625**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

While I understand the importance of ports, it seems like a waste of prime land that could be used to create public spaces

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#1625



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#1625



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	I don't know



#1625



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	I don't know
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

YES PLEASE to a new library. The current one in Takapuna is in need of an upgrade!

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No thankyou

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No , the current budget is OK



#1629



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Public transport is important but underused due to lack of consistency & changes to timetables .. Bayswater buses have very few passengers, the ferry timetable to Bayswater is inadequate. It's frustrating

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Getting the traffic lights in sync with the traffic's flow at the time of day ... more roundabouts , the one corner of sunset and east coast bays road works well with high density traffic.. the problem on east coast bays road is traffic lights not in sync...

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Traffic lights close together.... East coast bays rd...

The silly 30 km stop go ... confusingly silly Takapunas main st that leads to / Anzac Ave have a 30 km limit with a 50 km sign that is at the roundabout ... but you drive towards Milford and it's 30 km ... the police are giving lots of tickets at that area... its a joke but not funny when you get a ticket

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

All of North Shore deserves a decent recreational sports area ... Albany is so busy in the weekend, there's not a decent bus service . To have a decent stadium in Central Auckland would be an amazing sport and music venue: Bus, train and ferry services .... Similar to New Yorks time square ...an entertainment, central hubb



#1629



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Once it's gone , it's over ... it's a valuable resource, look what happened to the \$700 million raised with the petrol tax ... an appalling situation ....

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

We sell all of our valuable resources to overseas stakeholders. look at the mess the ferry service is ... increasing costs, unreliable service, ferries breaking down .... We need to pull our socks up and deliver, have control of our resources... to me health and safety of our workers , an environment that works for the people of Auckland . Another country would only have money making concerns .....

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The future of Auckland is pivotal... the most important city, port in NZ ... it needs protection from overseas developments...

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#1629



Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

The space is an important resource for both port operations and Auckland public ... it is also the most important are for large boats and tourism... currently it's mostly an eye saw in parts . Americas cup made a huge difference to Auckland's ambience...

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

Same rationale as above

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1629



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No thankyou



#1629



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important



#1629



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Very Important

**Tell us why**

We need to keep the ambiance of this very special area, by the seaside, historic mountains , iwi connections, parks, maintained water management so sewage does not ruin our beaches, clear out the drains so we don't flood , and people lose there houses in flash floods .. the list goes on ... comes under the umbrella of Housekeeping

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It's OK... but is it enough .. we need people to care about our community please

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduced the minimum wage



**#1660**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It's getting too expensive to live in Auckland already

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Only the central structure

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Everything

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#1660**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

It's good to utilise the resources

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Since council service need fund. It could get it from here

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Do not charge more! The everything is getting more expensive in new Zealand! People need to live and have life here!

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

It's working fine at the moment

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#1660



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#1660



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Upgrade access facilities eg beach board walks, beach showers, create dog parks

We need airport transport from the north shore

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1787**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Public transport from the shore doesn't work for most people who need to move around the shore

It's only good for a direct bus to the city

We need an airport bus

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Airport bus

More crossings around schools / busy pedestrian areas

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycleways that no one uses

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### Tell us why:

It's a great resource on the north shore

It'll take decades to build another stadium if we lose this one

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know



**#1787**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Move the port

Use the land for bars / restaurants / public space / recreation

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#1787



**Tell us why:**

It's a beautiful part of the city

Could be used for something that everyone can enjoy

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1787



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#1787



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Dog parks

Reduce dog access to beaches



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Clean the harbour

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cycle lanes and speed bumps



**#1853**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Currently extremely wasteful

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Getting public transport working

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycling lanes and road cones

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Great asset that could effectively support Moana pacjica etc

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We keep going around in circles this proposal should stop that a decision needs to be made and stuck with



**#1853**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Time to decide and act

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#1853



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#1853



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#1853



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Facilities should be enhanced for the benefit of local residents not ideological concepts.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More green commute

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less cars on road



**#1918**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The cost of living is high already plus imposing another tax is like murdering in recession.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Not right now

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Petrol

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

We do not need another stadium our hospitals have waiting of 3 hours minimum for any emergency treatment.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#1918**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#1918



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#1918



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#1918



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#1925**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#1925



I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1925



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#1925



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important



#1925



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#1928**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Originally built with a lot of public money and input.

Huge population growth in the area.

A much needed public facility in the North Harbour Region.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#1928



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#1928



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

economic stability

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Environmental regulation area and urban development



**#1940**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Because it is a basic life service.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Road pavement on the outskirts of the city

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

doesn't exist

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

No experience using it

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I believe that the difficulty in securing capital is related to the size and time required.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#1940**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I think the current rotation should be focused on reinvestment and future vision rather than on consumption.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Same as above

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

doesn't exist

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

There is a lack of understanding of the current problem

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#1940



**Tell us why:**

If usage has decreased or additional costs are incurred due to old age, it seems better to convert for public benefit rather than improve it. For example, museums, performance halls, etc...

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1940



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

doesn't exist

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#1940



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

Because I admit that I am doing well.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I hope that welfare policies for the underprivileged become more realistic and diverse.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Bicycle lanes (separate from car lanes)

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1943**



Less focus on anything that stimulates car use. ANY improvement in flowthrough will be undone by an increase in use in 6 months.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycling and walking, and public transport, as only these have a beneficial future.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Car infrastructure

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Probably the dumbest thing you can do is to sell monopoly, essential infrastructure/services to a commercial operator.



**#1943**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Any profit from the port is taken from those who import and export. It needs to go back to those asap. PoAL should be a non-profit (especially pay the leadership much less).

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Either move the port, or keep it here. Taking a small part of it and reducing the lease does not make sense as this cannot be compensated for by other activities on the same part of land. Get serious about moving the port out off the city center.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#1943



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#1943



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide	Very Important



#1943



decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Create valued and lively communities where people eat, drink, interact and shop locally (in walking/cycling distance).

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Better public transport

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#1949**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#1949



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	I don't know



#1949



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#1949



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important



#1949



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#1950**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I agree raised pedestrian crossings are a poor use of funds, but why not install safety islands in the middle when possible instead? Also, we really need a properly joined up cycle system. There is no safe route from the city south; Newmarket is a nightmare for cyclists. Why can people still park on Broadway but no cycle path?

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Coherent, but not overpriced cycle network.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Parking spaces on our main roads (e.g. Mt Eden; Dominion; Balmoral; St Lukes).

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Pointless stadium; vanity project for former N. Shore Council; demolish it and sell off some of the land.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#1950**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Surely a private owner will make it more profitable.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Why not use the proceeds to pay down debt? I didn't understand the objections to this simple solution. Also, do not self insure all of insurance risk; must continue to get underwriting for catastrophic risks. Some level of self insurance to reduce premiums is sensible.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#1950



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#1950



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
--	--------------



#1950



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Deliver better outcomes for Māori, by Māori/mana whenua/mātāwaka.

Get Councilor's to understand the need to upskill better about te ao Māori rather than tick-boxing their way through their foci.



**#1995**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Ensure contracting is delivered through a fit-for-purpose framework, that focusses on the outputs aligned with outcomes.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public Transport options and reduced emission options are better overall for moving people from car-based transport rather than public transport infrastructure and usage.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

providing car-based transport options.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It is an under utilised piece of infrastructure, so it could be off-loaded from Council's books.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#1995**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#1995



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#1995



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna, Puketāpapa

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide	Very Important



#1995



decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Puketāpapa Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Puketāpapa in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Invest in opportunities to support local community leadership.	Very Important
--	----------------



#1995



Invest in climate change response initiatives and support volunteer groups working on local environmental restoration / protection and climate action programmes.	Very Important
Consider our investment in facilities and services to see if there are opportunities to do better.	Very Important
Support initiatives that improve and encourage walking and cycling opportunities.	Very Important
Help coordinate and support local business groups.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Puketāpapa proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2007**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

The stadium has such value and used to be such an awesome venue for our niche sports and other events. Let there be more concerts and let there be more rugby games. Give it to the new A league team let them develop it, turn it into what it was supposed to be and not what it currently is... a neglected dump.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#2007



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#2007



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2016**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

North Harbour is a prized asset of the North Shore community yet is under-utilised.. it needs to be given its fair share of sports and entertainment events. It's ideally situated at the centre of the shore in a commercial area close to public transport. As well as needing more big events it's a vital hub for local / junior sport and would be a devastating loss to the community. Why is there no similar question on other stadiums? Has the decision already been made?

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#2016



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#2016



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#2016



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Auckland Council has been in operation since 1st November 2010. One of the initial stated aims was efficiency and standardisation across the region so why 14 years later do we still not have Council rubbish bin collection or sealed roads in Rodney?

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important



#2016



Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Most of these priorities or not at all important. The only two priorities should be fixing Lake Road and the ferries. These are not even listed.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cycle ways



**#2047**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Education

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Water

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#2047



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
--	----------------



#2047



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2047



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Fairly Important



#2047



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Non core activites



**#2079**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycle improvements are needed for safety and to encourage cycle use.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Alternative transport forms

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The stadium provides for much better viewing of games than Eden Park or Mt Smart. It is a purpose designed stadium with close contact with the game. The real problem is that it does not get the games. Further the population growth is to the north and North Harbour is better sited to meet this future demand.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#2079**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#2079



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#2079



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#2079



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Minimise flooding

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2081**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Hold off on raised pedestrian crossings. I've seen some installed then taken out again.  
Keep public transport as it is.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#2081



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#2081



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#2081



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important



#2081



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	I don't know
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2117**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#2117



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#2117



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2117



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Very Important



#2117



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Climate change resilience and decreasing GHG emissions

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2139**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Like the congestion charge scheme. Like a \$50 cap on weekly transit costs. I use bus ferry and train to get to work. Costs \$20 a day for that so drive my EV instead, spend life in a car. Encourage the Port and country in general to increase freight by rail and move away from inefficient trucks please.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Electrification of transport, maybe more light rail?

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Agree need to decrease service to less populated areas. Live style blocks are a privilege.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Other than the puckle ball enclosed tennis ball court building I haven't used North harbor area. Redevelop it to make more attractive to wider group of community seems like good idea. Pool, hot water park, basketball courts, mini golf, skate park, community halls I don't really know what...

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



#2139



**Tell us why:**

Seems to offer resilience in form of partial self insurance, diversify investment

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

You reported that this has worked well in Australia

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Diversity of investment, flexibility, decrease risk

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Agree with central proposal, self insurance seems prudent, climate crisis inevitable. What are you going to do about rising sea levels? Downtown Auckland will be flooded within 50 years.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#2139



Presently inefficient use of land. Port taking up too much of waterfront overall.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Like option to move the entire port elsewhere eventually. Make it easier to move freight by rail if don't have to deal with central city congestion. I know there is a sand bar in Manukau harbor, but if self insured you can just dredge it and not worry about Lloyd's of London. Best Close in option.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	Support



#2139



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Idiotic to get rid of the pay as you throw policy. Everyone will stuff their bins with junk/ inorganics since they are paying for it anyway! I know I will , no more trips to the tip. Currently, only fill our bin every 4 weeks or so. Will put it out every week if paying for the service. Got lots of junk to get rid of.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna,Rodney



#2139



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	I don't know

Tell us why

Encouraging a sense of community is a nice idea but probably hopeless



#2139



**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Everything sounds fine, not sure if we really need a new library. Old one still works. The one in Devonport is beautiful but the function is to make books available for people to read. Be utilitarian in this time of climate crisis.

## Rodney Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Fairly Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	Very Important
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	Fairly Important
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	I don't know
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Very Important



#2139



Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Very Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	I don't know
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

Nothing really matters except trying to prevent the climate catastrophe.

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Emergency response, recycling, waste reduction all good. Rodney needs a multi specialty medical center. Growing population is over a hour from specialty health care providers. Push Te Whatu Ora to provide this.

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Not from the Rodney area

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop the household compost collection.



**#2147**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Not enough investment on fixing congestion on local roads e.g. Lake Road in Devonport.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Yes, remove carparks on all arterial roads. Widen selected arterial roads.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycleways, speedhumps.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

The current stadium is now a white elephant and not fit for purpose. It is not worth maintaining and a "start with a clean sheet of paper" is now needed for the precinct.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#2147**



Makes complete sense to put all investment assets into a central fund and have this professionally managed by an external fund manager. The government's own New Zealand Super Fund has done extremely well and is a good model to follow.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Upfront cash inflow plus let an expert run the operational aspects of the port, council hasn't seemed to of done a great job of this in the past.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Right now, immediate cashflow is more important than future cashflow.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#2147



Greater benefit to the city and residents if this area developed for either public or private use.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Same as above.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Support



#2147



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?



#2147



I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2153**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

How about the Auckland Bridge alternative?

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#2153



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Unsure... it depends on future plans for this terminal. It think it all depends on whether the benefits are greater than the foreseen costs.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

I don't know



#2153



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#2153



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Very Important



#2153



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Libraries!! Please!

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2162**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Keep the airport stocks.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#2162



Move the port - free up that land for the community.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Move them to free up the land for the people!

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#2162



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#2162



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Very Important



#2162



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2178**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

North Shore needs a stadium given the size of the community including large new subdivisions being built in Milldale, Orewa, Silverdale and Red Beach and events should be held on the North Shore. The stadium cost millions of dollars to build and this spend cannot be wasted.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#2178



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Do not support



#2178



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2178



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	I don't know
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	I don't know
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles	Fairly Important



#2178



Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Second harbour crossing NOW

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2180**



Cycleway in the city that are never used the cyclist still use the road in Quay street after years of disruption

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Until you have a public transport system that works and is reliable and an alternate to buses to the North Shore you cannot put road tolls on at peak hours,

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Looking to the future Now, a second harbour crossing should have been built decades ago

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

We need a stadium on the Shore, not everyone wants to travel across the city epically when you are trying to get traffic off the motorways and roads and building more and more housing developments on the Shore

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



**#2180**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Waste of prime land

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#2180



Tell us why:

Waste of prime location

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#2180



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I don't know

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
--	--



#2180



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Benefits a small %

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Be bold make decisions



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2194**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#2194



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#2194



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#2194



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important



#2194



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Changing existing names of places.



**#2220**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#2220



I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

Save money.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Do not support



#2220



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#2220



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	



#2220



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

The CV of our properties are not in line with property market prices, and you are raising both CV and rates to fund yourselves. The increase in CV and rates are not proportionate to how our average salaries go up. Many large companies are currently laying off staff and this is very bad timing. Please consider the state of economy when making decisions to increase your funding. I would prefer that we do less and keep rates the same.

Thank you.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Work on sporting grounds that can involve multiple sports , there are many school and public fields that are in poor condition

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2275**



Less rate increases to residential

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Regional Fuel tax should stay , its not helping with Govt etc reduce by \$0.11 c we would be worse off and this that can afford higher fuel drive more economical and battery operated vehicles , your penalising the poor - mid families

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Roads and sports facilities, get more youth playing sport with better facilities

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Keep the stadium , I don't understand all that money to remove the stand for baseball , knee jerk reaction , outer oval for Cricket , invest so its a good stadium for 30,000 people

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#2275**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#2275



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#2275



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#2275



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

## Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low	



#2275



carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of ‘fit for purpose’ local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I support most priorities

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

Fairly Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	Fairly Important



#2275



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Very Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2301**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#2301



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2301



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#2301



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important



#2301



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

2nd Harbour crossing

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2316**



Spend less on governance

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Roads, infrastructure

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Governance

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#2316**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#2316



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#2316



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#2316



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Make public transport free

Implement road tolls for peak hours in to the central city



**#2329**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Focus on efficiency, and minimise wastage

Don't employ consultants, use the talent within the council and/or business community.

Dont take on more debt, only do what we have available to spend.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need better and safer cycle paths to reduce carbon footprint and ease congestion.

Agree with capped passes, but even better make them free. Can we put up rates by x% (or leave the regional fuel tax on) to fund it. The more people use public transport the better the public transport will be.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Free public transport, it is a public good, dont privatise it. The cities that have done this function better than we do.

We need to suck it up and invest in an underground rail network. Every year we wait it gets more expensive, and all the cities in the world that have them work much more efficiently than Auckland .

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

On making plans and not doing them. There appears to be inconsistent decision making, and this will incur costs unnecessarily. Make a plan and stick to it,

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is,Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**



**#2329**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

If we sell off all our assets we sell off future income streams, We need a long term approach here and realise that some things will just need to happen slowly.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

If someone else can operate the POAL more efficiently then why cant the council get its act together and do so. We should maximise our returns from our assets, and a massive injection now will only slow us down in the future.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#2329



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2329



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna



#2329



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



**#2329**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Issuing free grants of our money to special interest groups



**#2343**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Sack the entire executive. They are overpaid and underachieve.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

I don't trust the council to manage anything

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



**#2343**



**Tell us here:**

I don't trust the council to manage anything

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Lower the rates only!

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Can we get a change of all council overpaid executives who are all underachieving. I mean sack the lot.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

It is an eyesore at the moment

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#2343



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#2343



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#2343



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Lake road traffic improvement should be done now!

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Heritage retention.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2346**



Stop building so many raised pedestrian crossings on the roads.

Stop introducing intermittent 30 km / 50 km changing speed zones in suburban areas.

Stop building expensive staircases up and down the maunga, given that people are very happy walking on dirt tracks.

Stop removing historic trees from the maunga.

Plant fewer big trees on the maunga. People want to be able to see the maunga, and also to enjoy the views from the maunga, rather than just seeing trees.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

I support improvements to public transport.

I would like to see continued investment in cycleways. The cycleway from Orakei Station to Glen Innes Station is amazing. I would like to see more of these.

I would like to see work on raised pedestrian crossings stopped or reduced considerably.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport and cycleways.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings and chopping and changing between 30 km and 50 km per hour streets within individual suburbs. Few people seem to take much notice of the 30 km zones anyway.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct



#2346



**Tell us why:**

I understand the stadium is under-utilised. The location isn't ideal for getting large numbers to and from by public transport. So why keep it? Our stadia should be on our train routes. Can some of this land be re-used for housing?

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I support the idea of the fund but I am concerned about the proposal to sell shares in Auckland International Airport.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

I support moving the port out of Auckland city. Auckland deserves a waterfront it can be proud of.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The city needs so much money spent on it. This requires savings as well as loans.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#2346



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

As above. Auckland deserves a waterfront it can be proud of.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Huge potential for increased amenity value on the waterfront.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2346



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#2346



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important



#2346



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Very Important

**Tell us why**

I support heritage retention in Devonport.

I believe too much money has been spent in recent times on raised pedestrian crossings, 30 km per hour speed areas, staircases on Mt Victoria, and new children's playgrounds.

I believe Mt Victoria and North Head should continue to be visible, rather than being so heavily planted with native trees that views of them and views from them both disappear.

I catch the 7.30 a.m. ferry to the city and the 5.00 p.m. ferry back to Devonport because these sailings generally depart on time. Many others are delayed as one ferry cannot go there and back in half an hour at rush hour when there are large numbers of people. I would like to see two boats, one going in each direction every 20 minutes at rush hour.

A lot has been spent on playgrounds in recent years. Was the playground in Derby Street really needed, given the size of the playground by the ferry wharf?

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I think they are not worded very strongly or evocatively, i.e. they are not worded to catch the public imagination.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

You can't say you are going to increase rates - which you are in all options proposed and cut services. I would like you to reduce staff and spending costs at council in the first instance. The council is so dysfunctional, having to had call / email people in several departments. Too many people. No results. Not efficient.



**#2360**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Reduce internal staff and internal spending.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Forget the cycleways, you have wasted enough time on cycleways that are not getting used.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

north Shore needs this stadium and supporting fields, it is under utilised, it needs a re look at and adjustment to better suit the community, but i wouldn't want us to lose it.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#2360**



I think you'd waste the money. Leave as is.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Don't see this off.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

And reduce rates.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Stop increasing rates. It's not sustainable.

Surely more homes being built creates more rates.

Tighten up your spending belts. Reduce staff and costs and stop adding more costs to Aucklanders.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**



#2360



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#2360



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#2360



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	I don't know
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Absolutely NOT.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2398**



Traffic cones and the stop/go workers do absolutely NOTHING to improve safety around roadworks. get rid of them and let drivers negotiate works using common sense. Stop renaming parks etc in Te Reo. Utter waste of ratepayers money.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The council has destroyed the flow of traffic around our suburb with 30km/h areas, speed bumps, moving bus stops into the traffic lanes and ridiculous numbers of cones. Stop all works that are slowing down movement and stop paying ridiculous amounts of money for these contracts.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Expensive (electric) council cars, traffic cones and speed bumps, Te Reo signage,

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#2398**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Leave the port alone.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

There seems to be huge wastage and overruns when the council touches anything. Leave the current port businesses alone

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#2398



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2398



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

The council should ONLY be spending money n the absolute necessities given the current cost of living crisis, and the very poor services we are already receiving. Inadequate stormwater for all the infill housing that has been approved without extending infrastructure Is a good example. Start providing adequate infrastructure BEFORE approving infill housing. Get rid of road cones and get the city moving!!

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support any priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#2398



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Absolutely no faith in our local board who have massively underdelivered in this suburb

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Better upkeep of parks like mowing lawns regularly & weed control.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No more movies in parks, seems like a waste of money, people can go to the movies.



**#2415**



No support of festivals, these need to be financially viable on their own.

Stop wasting money on speed bumps and expensive cycleways, build cycle paths cost effectively.

Stop wasting money on city centre projects that delete carparks & ultimately cause shops to close - take a look at what happened in Takapuna after all the carparks were taken away & the road reduced to a one way system.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Stop wasting money on trains, they are too slow and very unreliable. I can drive to Wiri in 30 minutes in rush hour but public transport is a 2 hour trip one way at the same cost. Who has time for that? Buses are great, the NX1 service is super fast & very reliable

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

There are too many stadiums in Auckland and this one is almost never used, complete waste of money, sell the land. It's very easy for us North Shore people to use a park n ride station & catch an event bus to Mt Eden or Mt Smart. The event buses are super well organised and there are always lots available.



**#2415**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Seems like a lot of money will be needed to set this up and run it.

Sell the shares.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

POAL is poorly run and it's easier to ship into Tauranga and use metroport to get containers in which is ridiculous when it's right on our doorstep.

See if Mainfreight want to use their expertise to run it properly & get freight moving.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#2415



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

As Auckland is growing we need the freight capacity and once this land is gone it will never be able to be returned to port use if it's needed.

There is plenty of open space for Aucklanders to use in much better locations.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2415



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna



#2415



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

#### Tell us why

### 7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



**#2415**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Build light/heavy rail to North Shore

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2435**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Build more car separated cycle infrastructure and light rail

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Things that mean I don't have to drive everywhere

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Car centric things

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The airport is a critical piece of infrastructure that the city should have some control over

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#2435**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#2435



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#2435



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#2435



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2443**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Auckland Transport needs to stop wasting money and concentrate on delivering value for money - \$500k per speed bump is outrageous!

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Auckland Transport needs to stop wasting money and concentrate on delivering value for money - \$500k per speed bump is outrageous!

There appears to be a distinct lack of cost consciousness at Auckland Transport.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

If it can't pay its way, then redevelop it.

Must be a transparent process.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

I think that this is will just result in frittering away of a valuable asset base.



**#2443**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Council just needs to manage the wharf more effectively. The prospective lessee will be doing just that and making an increased margin.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Pay back debt!

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Another stupid idea having a separate fund!

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#2443



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#2443



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Council needs to find ways to do more with less!

For too long we have just added to debt and we don't have much to show for it.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
--	---------------



#2443



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Local boards are next to useless anyway. They have little authority.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Ratepayers are sick of the wasted expenditure from Council. We need to find ways to do more with less.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2453**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We're all have to do more with less, so why can't council do the same?

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Every thing

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#2453



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#2453



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



**#2453**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Until people are back on their feet council need to consider the cost's Auckland are having to bear. Postpone until a later date when we've all recovered from this cost of living nightmare

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Not for the increase that it would warrant on rates.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2502**



Less useless roadworks. I am 100% for road development that causes big improvements however from my experience we action so much that is not required and over budget.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Reliable public transport would mean I would use it. Currently, I cannot use it as I cannot rely on it.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#2502**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

More cost effective.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

We cannot afford to spend funds on 'nice to have' projects at the moment.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#2502



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#2502



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important



#2502



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

We can't afford this. Funding should be directed to improving transport on lake road.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

For the city to look great e.g. mowing lawns, gardens, sweeping leaves from drains, improving pathways.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2523**



Less events

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need lake road and esmonde road improved. It is ridiculous that there is one lane roads when 3 could easily fit.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

We need lake road and esmonde road improved. It is ridiculous that there is one lane roads when 3 could easily fit.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Dont have the \$

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#2523**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#2523



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#2523



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#2523



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Needs to focus on roading

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2553**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#2553



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2553



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2553



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important



#2553



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Fix the roads and traffic congestion. Wider roads / flow rates for commuters / faster limits.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2582**



Cease Te Reo Maori language and signage and its implementation of ALL public buildings and public services. It is extremely confusing for immigrants and tourists alike and visually just signage pollution.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Everything AT has done over the last several years has been a failure. All under table dealings and corrupt projects have come at a cost of Aucklanders to the point that it affects not only daily lives but the economy in general - strategically reductions seen now from logistics and even small business desire to transport or visit certain areas at certain times.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Architectural significant buildings. Underground power lines and improved Network connectivity. Permanent beautifications of street frontage rather than mundane concrete paths and shotty patchwork repairs.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

ALL Maori and AT consultations - Each party currently established are corrupt in their own agendas.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#2582**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Implementation of funds in council services is still investment either way

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#2582



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#2582



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#2582



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More redundancy payments to get rid of the fat cats in unelected council money wasters like AT.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2611**



Less salary rises and cut out food being supplied for meetings.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Transport costs and projections should be kept separate from roading costs.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Roading improvements.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycle lanes and associated works.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

The stadium should be upgraded, expanded and fully roofed.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

At least its an attempt to do something. Hopefully it will work.



**#2611**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

If the sort of price suggested could be realised, it is more than the council would make when owning and running it. Makes sense if estimates are accurate.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Why not?

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

I feel it important to develop one wharf to offer berthing for large cruise ships as offered at most other ports in NZ. Auckland should be up with the play rather than playing catch up.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

One or other could be extended to cater for very large cruise ships to offer a berth to equal what most other ports in NZ offer.



#2611



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Auckland needs the facility. Either as a large cruise ship berth or container facility.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>



#2611



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

School recycling charges should be increased to reflect actual costs. Ratepayers should not subsidize government responsibilities.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities



#2611



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Top importance is to save on unnecessary costs.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Haven't read it yet. But I suspect there is the usual confusion by combining transport with roading in costings when these areas of work are a totally different need.



**#2611**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2756**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#2756



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2756



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#2756



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important



#2756



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2783**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Former ratepayers of North Shore City fought long and hard for this facility and I for one am not prepared to see it go in its present form

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This is a sensible and prudent approach

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#2783



This is a sound longer term approach

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

This is a sound proposal

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#2783



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support



#2783



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Not Important



#2783



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

The budget needs tightening

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Acceptable with some reservations

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

No



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No. It's time that special interest groups stopped demanding thing and for 10 year council saves so it can spend in the future

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2790**



Every local board endorses spending money for local projects that run to tens of millions. Stop those for 10 years as they are nice but not necessary

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

There is an easy no revenue raising way to stop congestion and get people into public transport. Make one day a week each family cannot use a car. Minimum cost to implement. , huge fines for flouting !

Restore parking on major routes and in the city. Parked cars slows traffic movements instead of wide open boulevards that need signage, raised crossings, speed bumps . It also supports shopping areas auckland wide .

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Not at the moment . It's hard times

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

Whatever you do will cost annual dollars. Get private enterprise to run it on a % revenue basis and the 3.3m annual cost will be reduced to something more manageable. Council and idiot corpiraes would be the only organisations that would think downsizing and re building is a positive option

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#2790**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The councils expertise in airports and ports is zero ! A minor shareholding gives no control. So yes invest in something that will return large \$

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Council is a clueless port operator

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#2790



The port is a blight on our city. Get it back to the public

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Blight on the city

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#2790



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities



#2790



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

You ate broke. These are nice to haves but only a small % of the boards area will benefit from these. proposals . Stop spending until you have surplus funds. None of these issues will be make or break or will make much difference to people living in the boards area

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#2790**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2807**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#2807



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#2807



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Other
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Do not support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Do not support



#2807



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important



#2807



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Beautification of the city including parks and more street trees.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2809**



Thoroughly look at Auckland Transport work program and ensure it is linked to Auckland outcomes, including supporting growth areas, more PT and walking and cycling. Less on pointless road. Ensure that Waka Kotahi is not dominating transport decisions.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

AT work program needs a complete overhaul as noted above. Cancel wasteful and destructive projects like Lincoln Road.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Transport infrastructure to support growth areas including local road improvements and getting PT services into these areas as soon as possible.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Large multilane roading projects.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

### **Tell us why:**

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

### **Tell us why:**



**#2809**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Move Bledisloe to Council ownership within 5 years also to enable regeneration of waterfront.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other



#2809



Tell us why:

Transfer Bleisloe earlier

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2809



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Funding of growth areas is dysfunctional. The LTP states focus will be in Northwest, KO growth areas and Drury, or in other words the Council continues to play second fiddle to government priorities. The Council should introduce a targeted rates policy to apply to any greenfield or brownfield growth area so that roading, public transport, parks and drainage upgrades can be properly planned and funded by those who benefit. Its unacceptable for plan changes to continue to be approved with no certainty about who will pay for infrastructure and transport funding is the most broken aspect of this model with AT doing what Waka Kotahi wants, not the Council. IT HAS TO CHANGE.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**



#2809



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Focus on more street tree planting

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

redundancy of staff. The council has become dis-functional and should be utilising external services. Clean the beaches.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2829



Council should not be bailing out those idiots who chose to buy on cliff tops, under them or in flood zones or who chose not to insure. Joint and several liability has to go from the building act so council (rate payers) aren't picking up builders issues who then phoenix their company and walk away with profits. No more raised pedestrian crossings, no more redesigning town centres (which is destroying them and their communities often). No more Gay parades financed. treat all citizens the same with only special interest to those in need. No more bulls\*\*\* about building another stadium, we have plenty already.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stop the cycle waste. It is not feasible to cycle over the harbour bridge so stop wasting money on it and creating traffic jams due to cycle lanes elsewhere. Put cycle lanes on footpaths! Public transport works fine now so stop wasting money on intangible \*\*\*\*\*/statements/evaluations.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Potholes! and road repairs.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Anything that is not essential. Less publications which nobody reads and no doubt costs a fortune.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

there is constant articles (and lets not forget the previous mayors activity)about building another stadium in Auckland to replace Eden park. This is total lunacy and profligate wastage! Perhaps someone could talk to Moana Pacific rugby, NZ cricket,



**#2829**



speedway etc etc about their use of the stadium as they all seem to be cited as justification for another one in Victoria park or on the waterfront..

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

There is something called Insurance which if used properly is the cheapest access to mass capital in the event of a loss. Council should not be a third party asset owner, building funds which may never have a use whilst rating all the elderly off their properties. This is a crime against society! Sell the port, airport shares, and any other assets to drop debt (and rates) and return a dis-functional business into a manageable and less costly operation. Also rates should not be calculated on the value of the property. They should be the same for everyone who get the same service for them.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

sell the lots and move the port. How much longer can we continue killing the gulf, stifling our roads with trucks, taking up of the most valuable land in the country. Also get rid of the naval base. Dry dock moved to Whangarei and all other services distributed around the country to more appropriate locations. Sell the land!

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

reduce debt! it is unsustainable.



**#2829**



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Council has moved from running essential services to this giant unmanageable consumer of money with little to show for it. i voted for change and want to see it. Get rid of as many council controlled businesses, reduce wages and salary costs, Festivals are not as important as our beaches and lifestyle. So many people use our parks and beaches for free and its great to see this. Only a minority go to festivals etc. The whole process of building act approvals needs to change. Council employs too many engineers etc who are failing to do this job. Instead set the rules and as in other countries demolish anything that does not comply at the builders cost. Make consultants (architects) liable for anything they design non compliant etc. The council needs to avoid the funding of third party profits and risk reduction!

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

has anyone been to Ala Moana Park in Waikiki? That's what we should do with the wharves when the ugly, dirty, road clogging (and lets not forget dangerous)port is moved away from inner Auckland.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

read above

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#2829



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#2829



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

We are heading into an ice age according to the government climatologist. Climates always change. Man cannot effect that. STOP TRYING TO JUSTIFY WAISTAGE OF FUNDS UNDER THIS INITIATIVE....

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide	Fairly Important



#2829



decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

These comments probably apply to all local boards. Rates need to be reduced by atleast half! not increased. Local boards nice to have \*\*\*\*\* about Iwi etc are an unnecessary waste of funds!

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

waste of rates!

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Rates need to be reduced not increased. That means less staff in the council, change of activities and a return to core.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Lake road improvements

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2843**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Lake road improvements

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#2843



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#2843



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#2843



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Very Important



#2843



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I would not be prepared to pay for anything else. Auckland council have a history of mismanagement and gross wastage.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2845**



do less of everything except for maintenance of storm water and sewage infrastructure

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

there is nothing I would spend more on.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

spend less on everything especially expensive roading contracts. for Auckland council to pay \$500 thousand for a single pedestrian crossing when Wellington can get it completed for \$60 odd thousand shows how out of touch Auckland Council are. Traffic management is a farce, the number of cones is ridiculous and most of the time the roading contractors are on their phones or having breaks and not paying any attention.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#2845**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

use the profits towards funding Auckland Councils budget

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

I don't have confidence in Auckland Councils ability to manage anything without blowing the budget. So leave the wharves as they are - managed by the port.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#2845



No faith in Auckland council to be able to deliver anything for a sensible price, on time, on budget or to scope.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2845



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Cut wasteful spending and DO NOT increase rates.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
--	---------------



#2845



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Spending should be prioritised on essentials - eg maintaining adequate community facilities (public toilets, changing facilities, etc)and key items which are of high value to our community, eg sport and recreation (for our young people and children), heritage.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Priorities are more focused.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Everyone needs to stop wasting money, this includes local boards!



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Council needs to stop spending resources (and taxpayer dollars) improving and developing the city, including making us safer. The transport and the water services and flooding are real and present dangers; having an urban mall, like Las Ramblas in



#2870



Barcelona, is in Grey Lynn or Takapuna, let alone Queen Street, is nice but does not need the City's leadership at this time. Please stop improving, and get on with fixing.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

The Lake Road cycleway - a critical link in cyclists' journeys - has maybe 15 people per hour during daylight, and much less at night. The two car lanes have maybe 15 people per minute. We all understand the theory, but there must be (and are) other ways to reduce private car usage than the "build it and they will come" philosophy of Auckland Transport. The kids from the Intermediate School use the sidewalks, by the way. The cycleway on the road is way to dangerous for them, even with the traffic moving at 10 km/h.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Auckland in particular, and New Zealand in general, have a well deserved reputation for a lack of (economic) productivity. Capital projects - roads, tunnels, bridges, infrastructure in general - cast far more than anywhere else, partly because they take longer. Which is partly why we now have this "crisis". Throwing more money at it is not going to address the problem; getting a bit more efficient is. Mayor Brown has shouted at both Labour and the Nats to co-ordinate an integrated plan for the isthmus. Could we please get on with it.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Definitely spend LESS on Auckland Transport, which has proven more than deaf and incompetent.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Having spent less on, and reorganised, Auckland Transport, then spend less still. find another way to improve transport plans, public transport reliability, and transport efficiency. Sister cities, like Sydney or Vancouver BC, or even San Francisco, make far better use of their water access and ferry systems, but we spend more time



**#2870**



cancelling ferries because all of a sudden there is a cruise ship in the harbour. Appeared magically. What a surprise.

### **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

#### **Tell us why:**

It is not working now.

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

#### **Tell us why:**

Financing assets, particularly unproductive ones, is best left to professional, and/or experienced, managers.

### **4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

#### **Tell us here:**

Leasing the operation for 35 years slow-walks any significant change in how New Zealand imports and exports goods to the never-never. Mayor Brown made very good arguments, a bit ago, about the advantages of a major shift in port operations. The counter-proposals were misleading and simplistic in their arguments for doing nothing. It would be better not to foreclose future alternatives, at least until the current political cycle ends.



**#2870**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Note the comment before; financing unproductive assets is a tricky business, and should not be left to the bright ideas and impressions of Councillors. Using the Port to fund Council "services" - the term is used guardedly - simply prolongs the "Port of Auckland" issue. Kicks the can down the road. Ensures there is no serious change in what the Port does, where it does it, with whom, and when.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Insurance premiums are going to reflect the reality of the risk, regardless of how expensive it seems. So "self-insurance" does not somehow sidestep a premium - at best it affects the timing -- maybe by a year or two. Politically, maybe that is helpful.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Words fail. Could we please just get on with this. Residential and commercial please, not another open space/park that no one can or will use.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#2870



See the answer above. As long as POA is supported by a public crutch, as it were, the longer it will take to rationalise.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#2870



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

--

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
--	---------------



#2870



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Many of the priorities are vague, except they cost resources, time, and money. What would be the impact if, for example, relationships with mataawaaka were not improved, but not degraded. Just kept at the current level. But what would the impact be for the community with degraded toilet facilities at Becroft Park? There must be trade-offs, there has to be focus.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Embarrassingly vague. What does "supporting environmental groups" when the environmental groups are doing the conserving of our parks and waterways? How about if we just abolish the Board? Put the funds saved in the Mayor's financial fund.



**#2870**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

CCO's were developed for specific reasons in the Fourth Labour Government. They have reached their use-by date, as the performance of the present Auckland CCO's demonstrates. A new form of governance structure is required going forward.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Do more things that benefit citizens (such as medical care)

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Waste less taxpayers' money and crack down on malfeasance



**#2879**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Serious waste

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Medical

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Unnecessary traffic circles and traffic lights

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#2879



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Do not support



#2879



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#2879



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna, Rodney

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	



#2879



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Rodney Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	



#2879



Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No not prepared to pay anymore. Costs are already too high and the council has too much wasteful spending. Plant trees in areas with too much grass, this means less mowing fees. No weed killers, use steam spray instead.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2903**



Less pest management. Less cultural events. No Maori funding- this is racism and discriminates against all the other cultures here.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

I support stopping raised crossings. They are a waste of money, time and a significant drainage issue for flooding. The one in Bayswater by the park, floods the entire area even with the smallest bit of rain. Need a tidal traffic system on lake road to address school traffic times. More school buses are needed with better drop offs to reduce the cars picking up.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More on traffic management. Tidal traffic system at peak times. Pot hole fixing.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Less on raised crossings, bike ways and electric ferries and vehicles. Electric cars and ferries are a fire hazard and too dangerous.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### **Tell us why:**

Don't need any more investment in this stadium. Focus on more swimming pools in Auckland. The stadium is fine.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#2903**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Auckland council needs more money and other investors can buy shares instead

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

No more trucks coming into auckland unless they come from south, not north. The trucks destroy the roads and create more traffic. Need utilise the trains for transporting goods.



#2903



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

We need goods shipped here.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support



#2903



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No fortnightly collections of rubbish we need weekly

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support any priorities



#2903



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Waste of money. Devonport library is great and there is nothing wrong with takapuna library. No investment needed. There is already enough playgrounds in the area, do not need to work on the Achilles reserve one, unless it will be a fenced playground like jutland road in Hauraki. Those are great. No iwi investment. They have enough money. Events are usually not that busy and just a waste of money. Let other organisations organise these.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#2903**



Stormwater upgrade is crucial. No more town houses and no infrastructure for it. greater funding the upgrade of Lake Road, and a new Bayswater Ferry Terminal. No more bike lanes. Underground crossing for takapuna grammar.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2919**



Get competitive tendering going .... Look at getting more efficient with what you have.  
There seem to be no commercial tension in the cost of getting things done

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stop wasting money on public transport that is under-utilised

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Again.... Get commercial with what you are spending ... it seems there is no discipline  
in looking at getting the same stuff done more efficiently

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Shut it down

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#2919**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#2919



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#2919



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Enhance urban environment by restricting intensification, protecting open spaces, more recycling and environmental protection

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#2922**



Not to own any businesses, work in partnerships only. Get rid of container port and develop waterfront to attract tourism and businesses supporting that.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Use tolls and fares to invest in enhanced sustainable renewal transport options. Bring back lake road light rail and tunnel.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Lake road upgrade and light rail with tunnel to city.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Roads generally

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

Get out of running businesses directly, work in partnership ensuring we have the facilities and amenities through such partnerships

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

### **Tell us why:**



**#2922**



Proceed with sale of businesses. Use proceeds to set up approach to work in partnership with businesses and communities to provide the infrastructure and amenities desired.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Sell the land but restrictive covenants on the types of developments permissible, like working in partnership with businesses and communities to provide infrastructure on site built around domestic and international tourism to make the city far more attractive by land and sea.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Use monies from sales to work in partnership with businesses and communities to accelerate enhancement of infrastructure to attract domestic and international tourism.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



#2922



Sell land and place restrictive covenants on the types of developments and use proceeds to accelerate infrastructure enhancements for Auckland to attract domestic and international tourism and trade.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Sell land and place restrictive covenants on the types of developments and use proceeds to accelerate infrastructure enhancements for Auckland to attract domestic and international tourism and trade.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	Support



#2922



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?



#2922



I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Supported



**#2922**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2927**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Raised pedestrian crossing isn't going to fix the core issues of unreliable & expensive public transport. Focus on the basics.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#2927



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#2927



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#2927



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important



#2927



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Putting in unnecessary pedestrian crossings (that most people ignore) and expensive raised crossings, bus platforms etc., While I support dropping zones to 30kph in



**#2939**



shopping centres, in Devonport, almost no one pays any attention to any of these new initiatives.

Our far bigger issue is Lake Road. Intensification is accelerating in every block along the road - more and more cars pouring into a funnel that doesn't work now. This is the best use of any road funding that Council has - not tinkering with expensive crossings, curb raises and barriers that don't improve safety.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Sort out Lake Road! This issue is strangling the whole of the Takapuna/Devonport peninsula, developers are jumping in before any law change to cram in townhouses as fast as they can. Not only is this development stretching the power and water resources of the peninsula, which were never scoped for this kind of intensification, it also means Lake Road will actually become completely gridlocked for many hours each day. Losing the Regional Fuel Tax while incentivising developers to cram in houses that do nothing to actually tackle the housing issue or provide low cost housing in any way, shape or form, is just doubling down on an existing, crippling problem for the lower north shore.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Too late for the money blown in Devonport village on unnecessary and expensive curb raisings, paint jobs and crossings that seem to be dug up routinely every month for even more tinkering - ridiculous.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**



**#2939**



We can't afford white elephants. I would not support losing valuable green space, but there is no doubt a compromise to create a new housing development area and retain plenty of useful, well planned public parks around it.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Airports around the world are privately owned and work perfectly well, likewise ports. I think the people of Auckland will benefit more from a redeveloped waterfront that opens up our best asset to public enjoyment, in a way that a city on the sea should have been planned from the beginning.

Would be good to bring cruise ships in somewhere other than the ferry area, too congested and delays for ferry commuters for 5 months of the year is a really major issue.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Ensure leasee is tightly managed, and that health and safety issues are improved rather than worsened in the pursuit of contractor profits.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#2939



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

A future fund is a good idea, provided it's not just the fund management who make the real money out of it.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

We need to improve the connection of our waterfront to the rest of our city, not see it sitting behind high gates. The best cities around the world have their port operations away from their busiest CBD areas, and have world class waterfronts where we can

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#2939



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#2939



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important



#2939



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

My priorities are library services, parks and recreational spaces, and environmental restoration/protection as well as improving things like stormwater, which impacts the peninsula. Events, etc...are really the icing on the cake. Being able to productively get to work via road and/or ferry is a much higher priority.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#2984**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#2984



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#2984



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#2984**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Actually build a second harbour crossing, instead of decades of consultations without a single action. Even the proposed bayswater to CBD gondola was something to increase resilience and decrease traffic.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3046**



All consultants and contractors at all levels of the organisation

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

There is no measurable actions, how much is the traffic going to be increased and how. Building more of anything without consequence is why we're in this mess. Stop spending money on the safer roads programme, all raised pedestrian crossings and new traffic lights.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Second harbour crossing, ERP programme, turning the northern busway into a light rail

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings, additional traffic lights,

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

Stop spending money on things that aren't broken!!! Better utilisation, sure, but is there now and running fine. 30m over 10 years is nothing compared to any other option.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#3046**



**Tell us why:**

Why is this a priority? Pay down debt and get back to operational surplus so Aucklanders stop getting thrashed with constant rate rises. Sell the shares and pay down debt.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#3046



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#3046



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#3046



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cycle ways.



**#3050**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#3050



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
---	-----------------------



#3050



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3050



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Fairly Important



#3050



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Safer cycling on smooth pathways, separated from dangerous drivers/ traffic. The Albany to Constellation bike walk pathway already is subsidising and uneven in many parts (I am a 4 day a week user), so 'make it once and good'.



**#3053**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less roads and motorway developments, encourages people to think there will always be space for cars I.e., in their Teslas and contributes to congestion because few people want to get out of that car and on to effective public or active transport options

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Its brainless to not follow other developing and developed countries' (depends on where in world) embracing of public transport and active transport options. If you want congestion, stop all cycle way or public transport corridor development, and make it only for the car. We are so unsophisticated here in NZ and so resistant to embracing environmentally friendly and sustainable options, Colombia and Ecuador can do way better than us, to mention a couple of cities once reliant on only fuel/ gas to move its citizens that then changed it (I.e., developing countries)

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycleways/ pedestrian ways, and getting people out of their beloved cars and on to light rail or buses.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cars/ more lanes anywhere. Always leads to more cars on road. Its proven.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**



**#3053**



Open its use to more than professional clubs. Expand its financial capacity by inviting more than major events/ sports. Turn it into a night market/ day market/ rentable venue (in parts) if not already.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

As long as all money is accounted for i.e., spending within AKL future fund and outcomes that WILL be realised. I.e., that lane of the harbour bridge will have a cycle and walkable capacity by 2026. It takes 8 months to set it up in current bridge form according to CAN. to get this going. It is Waka Kotahi digging their heels in against it maybe.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

This city is not going to move anywhere unless we get the old voices or resistant to change voices off council and start seriously planning a future, with better public transport for ALL modes of transport.



#3053



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Publics health is linked to activity and housing/ community design, and without walkable and green communities, generally the population health declines. Want that? I think we can do far better with repurposing unused spaces.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3053



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#3053



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important



#3053



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Cyclist safety on lake road remains poor. I am a daily user, either early morning, or late afternoon. The times I have had blind drivers cut me off or simply not permit a right hand turn when necessary is in the 100s now. The safety of cyclist needs targeting in any Lake Rd or nearby street design. Death, or being injured is the price of not.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

parking

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

less traffic restrictions



**#3075**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

get Auckland MOVING

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

sell it

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

sell all the airport

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other



#3075



Tell us here:

sell it

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

less council

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in



#3075



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#3075



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Cut

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Stop creating debt and raising rates. We are drowning

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Needless spending



**#3100**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycle lanes shouldn't be a priority

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#3100



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#3100



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#3100**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



**#3130**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

important public transport

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

as proposed

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

as proposed

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

for public facilities

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

good for everyone to benefit

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#3130**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

no idea

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

better return

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

no comment

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

no comment

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#3130



for everyone to benefit

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#3130



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

no change

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide	I don't know



#3130



decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	I don't know
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	I don't know
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	I don't know
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

no comment

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

no change

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

be more courteous



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3132**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stop wasting money on public transportation

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

T3 is built on the north bank, and the bus lane can also be used as T3

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Bike lanes, public transportation

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Switch to private company operation

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#3132



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Do not support



#3132



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Do not support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Do not support



#3132



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	



#3132



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

More T3, please



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3160**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#3160



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#3160



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#3160



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important



#3160



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#3194**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Public transport is not recommended off peak time. Reduce the trips and do some cost cuttings

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More Harbour bridge lanes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Road works traffic controls

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Not interested

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#3194**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#3194



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#3194



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important



#3194



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3195**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#3195



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#3195



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



**#3195**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

public transport and roads

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3214



extensive spending on countless pedestrian crossings close together (especially raised ones)

too many cycleways which are not used by enough people

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I think public transport is currently the best way we can improve congestion and emissions.

Cycling is not the answer. Auckland does not have the climate or geography for cycling.

I don't understand the obsession with so many raised pedestrian crossings. Some are justified but most are not, especially considering how expensive they are.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Just what is already mentioned in the proposal

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

If it is underutilised, relative to similar facilities, something should be done to use it more.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



**#3214**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need to invest in infrastructure that benefits Auckland. If we don't have the funds to do this without crippling levels of debt, then we need to sell some assets.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I tried to tread the background info but it is sideways and doesn't make it clear what the difference between the 2 options is.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

we need better infrastructure

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#3214



We need a downtown stadium and we should change Eden park back to houses like it should be.

The current port is an eye-sore

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

We need a downtown stadium and we should change Eden park back to houses like it should be

The current port is an eye-sore

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3214



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna



#3214



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

Tell us why

More important issues:



**#3214**



Storm and waste water

public transport

roads

emergency response/planning

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

could not find it

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3226**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#3226



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#3226



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Do not support



#3226



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important



#3226



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

There’s no evidence any of the expenditures proposed are based on actual costing. The model is fraught and autocratic. Putting services for tender with robust criteria and serious penalties for poor performance would bring the results expected.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3229**



Reduce bureaucracy. What's on offer is abject.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It's spin, not proposal. Saying you're going to do something without showing how is not a proposal

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Rates. We pay double per household compared to Sydney

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

It's not a priority in the current circumstances

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This one of the very few good proposals



#3229



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

It's logical. Council is to provide services, not to manage business.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Because

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#3229



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#3229



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#3229



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Pedestrian

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Community Safety

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Face Project



**#3296**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Community Safety

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Face Project

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#3296



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#3296



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Other
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Do not support



#3296



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	



#3296



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Grow a culture of efficiency and service not control. Undertake projects without “gold Plating”. Avoid overbuilding infrastructure. Address the unrealistic traffic management requirements. Require staff including CCO’s to work cooperatively with those doing things. Require developments to provide adequate offstreet parking to reduce street clogging and consequential community loss of amenity.



**#3322**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stick to the basics of Rooding, water supply, sewer and stormwater. Keep out of non core activity and funding support for non core activities. Reduce staff and grow a culture of efficiency. Get out of taking responsibility for building, except for town planning. Address the overbuilding and waste of money in infrastructure remove cycle lanes from roads where there is little use. Stop installation of unrealistically expensive traffic management structures such as raised pedestrian crossings, bus stop platforms and other gold plated obstruction to vehicle progression. Stop strategic removal of parking, while allowing developers to build without providing adequate offstreet parking

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Council gives the impression that it is not focussed on efficiency. Grow a culture of doing the basics but stop doing the nice to haves. There is even in the basics much overbuilding, raised pedestrian crossings being but one example. CCO's appear to be a law to themselves and out of control, imposing their view on the community rather than having a concept of service. Strategies to control communities are not appreciated, eg parking removal and unwanted work just because the budget is there mentality. The question should be "do we really need to do this?"

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Redundancy for Council staff

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Non core activities. Cycle lanes, raised pedestrian crossings, concerts and related non core activities.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management



**#3322**



**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The port is a vital strategic item and must be retained for the cities future. Create savings elsewhere, just increasing rates is not an option! Do less non core activities and what is done, do it at less cost!

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#3322



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3322



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna



#3322



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

#### Tell us why

Restrict to core services



**#3322**



7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Less waste and better spending I.e. Public transport versus raised crossings. A fortune has been spent in my area on these with around 50% on traffic management. Most will exacerbate flooding.

Why is there no all day parking at Akoranga Station? Around 8 3 hour parks is ridiculous.



**#3408**



Where's the rates contribution from the in- fill and new apartments going? Certainly not on park and ride for shore residents. Silverdale full most mornings before 8am, Albany you need to be there before 6.30am. Nothing of any significance further down. People will use this if they can so build multi storey parking. More people being packed in with no easy access to public transport. There is enough to go around, stop spending it on traffic management and vanity projects I.e. raised crossings in areas already 30 kilometres? Panuku to stop selling our land assets. I would like to see an open report on land assets sold and who to.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Traffic management for raised crossings. Any council funded traffic management to be scrutinised for over design. Less selling of land - lease it! Future generations will benefit. Currently put a hold on new cycleways, public transport and moving lots of people should be the priority. Salary freeze for all on over 200K.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We have to return to moving as many people by one trip and away from single car use. This should be a priority. Cycle ways are a distraction in Auckland and while eventually with more money they are great, with climate change and more rain it's not the most efficient spend.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Park and ride. New crossing with a dedicated T3 lane. T3 lanes, Small shuttle buses. Free school buses and student transport.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Again council initiated traffic management.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**



**#3408**



Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

I don't want yet more land sold. Why do we not lease hold it? This is what asset rich and wealthy countries do.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

As it seems currently unfunctional a change of management and implementation of new systems may hopefully improve its performance. However I would want negotiations on the proposed lease to be transparent after this time with cast iron guarantees that it would/could be returned to Aucklanders.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#3408



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Retain ownership. Always retain ownership.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

More trucks on the road is a ridiculous proposal. Until rail can be back and running to transport goods most shipped to Auckland are going to the most efficient location. However the 'car park is ridiculous- those need to be redundant. These would be perfect for Whangārei Harbour. Then transported by train.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3408



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#3408



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important



#3408



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3411**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#3411



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3411



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#3411**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Govt agencies are notoriously inefficient and you are no exception. Asking for more money is the lazy way out. Work smarter, trim fat and stop blowing money on useless initiatives that go nowhere. Finish what you start.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Cycling lanes and paths, bus lanes

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Local events and arts



#3475



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

We have tried this current use of the stadium and have shown that the current plan is not working. We need to take this into consideration and move to a new phase, a better phase. For example, if we had better buses for major events to Eden Park, we could use Eden Park more. It's the transport to Eden Park that North Shore people find difficult.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



#3475



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#3475



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3475



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Not Important



#3475



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

We need more parks, sport, recreation and physical activity to stay active and address obesity and health issues and loneliness

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

They sound good however please can Lake Road and Belmont shops be improved so we have more people on public transport, bikes, walking and improved safety for our children.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Full support for increasing public transport use, links, and safety of our children on the roads.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3486**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need to be concentrating on getting public transport more accessible and more widely used. Get more cars OFF the road.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Some system to get cars off the road- light rail, etc.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



**#3486**



**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

This is a hard decision as I think Auckland city needs better areas for the public. If that does happen, I hope better design goes into it than what we have had in the past. Researching other successful designs should be a must. But on the other hand, inc

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#3486



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#3486



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#3486



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It worries me that improving Lake Road falls outside of this plan. I'm not sure how this will develop.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

With the central rail link near completion. we need to keep building infrastructure to make our city easier to get around. Get the government to push ahead with the second harbour crossing as soon as possible!!



**#3507**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

no

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

we need to reduce congestion on our roads

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

improving the road and rail network

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

it's underused

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

the council should have shares and a say in the auckland airport



**#3507**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

The wharf next to the ferry building where the new cars come in is an eye sore. It is not what we should be using our prime waterfront land on in our CBD and it should be converted in to a usable public or commercial space

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

With so many cruise ship tourists coming in to our city. They should not witness a car park of new cars behind big red gates. That prime land can be used in a far better way for all people to use.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#3507



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

We can become a top world city by utilising these wharves land in to something else. it is prime real estate being wasted

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support



#3507



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

none, stick to the budget

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

all services, to have more savings



**#3527**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

use limited budget, more savings

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

road maintenance

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

it's alright as it is, few maintenance

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#3527**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#3527



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#3527



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#3527



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

too expensive - go minimal

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Get more brains. Some idiot (Mr Brown) thought it was a smart option to reduce staff across Auckland services but is too stupid to notice that they are hiring the same people back as contractors at higher costs. Talk about retarded.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3554**



Stop trying to sell off assets and increase rates. There are smarter options, albeit not as profitable.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Look at the more successful cities like Sydney and Melbourne who are heavily investing in infrastructure. Our roads and transport facilities are far below poor because no one has invested properly. Why are our motorways only 2 lanes wide in any area? Why haven't they all been expanded to 3+ lanes, the space is there use it.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

All transport infrastructure needs investment. Invest in a second harbour crossing, the current one is aging and will not stand up as the city grows. \$Xbillion now is still cheaper than twice as much in 10 years. Light rail was a waste of money for Auckland, that could have been spent on a new crossing. Stop wasting time talking about it, put up the money, do the crossing and TOLL ONLY NEW INFRASTRUCTURE, NOT EXISTING OR REVAMPED ROADS.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Wayne Brown's salary. We could use less stupidity in local government.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

North shore still needs a stadium, you can't expect to close/redevelop something the stadium AND charge north shore residents to get over to Eden Park as well.



#3554



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Stop selling assets. Only idiots sell off assets to get quick cash. At the end of it all, if you sell off the assets, what benefit is there, currently dividends are paid, long term wins.

If someone was smart, they might encourage Auckland Airport to expand operations to a 24 hour process, revamp the facility as a whole and bring it into a new prosperous era, at the moment it's sad, pathetic and tired.... And international only opens at 4.30am. It's a very 1980s mindset.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

POA is an asset, many millions have been spent reclaiming the land and expanding operations, why would anyone think releasing control and ultimate operations is profitable. All you are offering is less benefit for Aucklanders because any new operational business will run in there, increase costs and make everything worse while not investing in retention and maintenance.

One would have thought these options were actually thought up by a feral monkey.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services



#3554



**Tell us here:**

Keep ownership. Keep it simple. Stop adding layers and expenses to run extra layers of employment.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Please think smarter, not dumber.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Reduction in income generation to use it for non profitable purposes like “inclusive areas” is a waste of time. Look at the Cloud, it really has again been poor judgement.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Why would you reduce port operations and increase use of road use when AT already doesn't maintain roads sufficiently. It's like taking from both hands expecting to see double the money. Get real.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#3554



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Do not support



#3554



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

All proposals where Wayne Brown continues as Mayor should be dismissed.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Not Important



#3554



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Our Green spaces are less frequently maintained and look disheveled.

Our area is poorly administered and has been sad for years.

The new changes in Takapuna were a waste of money. It has no added value and merely removes income generation from the carpark that was there.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Wasted efforts.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3555**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#3555



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3555



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna



#3555



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



**#3555**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce duplication where it is identified. Reduce staff in line with the central government's expectations of government departments. Generally 'lean' down the council operation and set an example for ratepayers. The proposed rates increases



**#3566**



are pretty brutal for people who won't be getting pay rises in the next few years - and especially so for senior citizens who are on limited incomes.

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Public transport is the only way to solve Auckland's traffic woes. Fewer cars and vehicles on the roads are vital, but this means increased alternative forms of transport like bikes and scooters.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

s

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

get rid of the stadium altogether and use the land for housing / commercial development. It is a white elephant and could be turned into something that would generate revenue for the Council, rather cost money to operate.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:



**#3566**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#3566



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#3566



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#3566



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

In the current situation, I just hope that property taxes are not arbitrarily imposed. Many city councils believe that methods they consider beneficial to people's livelihoods are not directly felt by the public. We mostly feel like we're paying a lot of money for no apparent reason, and it seems like the money is not being used in the right places.



**#3651**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Anything that doesn't directly benefit the lives of the public should be reduced. In a situation where inflation is so alarming, we need more money for our needs rather than paying for nothing.

Anything that doesn't directly benefit the lives of the public should be reduced. In a situation where inflation is so alarming, we need more money for our needs rather than paying for nothing.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I just want to say: Anything the government wants to do should be done when there is a budget surplus, rather than exchanging the suffering of the people for their own political achievements.

I just want to say: Anything the government wants to do should be done when there is a budget surplus, rather than exchanging the suffering of the people for their own political achievements.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase public transportation spending to reduce the cost of public transit.

Increase public transportation spending to reduce the cost of public transit.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cease meaningless facade projects such as 'elevated pedestrian crossings and bike lanes.' These initiatives do not contribute meaningfully and should be halted.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know



**#3651**



**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

To improve people's quality of life.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know



#3651



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>



#3651



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#3651



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Protect our coast and waterways.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce funding to community groups and events.



**#3689**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Most of what is proposed makes no major difference for my family and I a second harbour crossing is what is needed.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

A second harbour crossing which could be accessed by public transport, pedestrians, bikes and scooters.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

It is an under utilized resource.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#3689



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

I don't know



#3689



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#3689



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Not Important



#3689



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Restore protection of historic buildings and trees rules. Otherwise Auckland will look like an overcrowded, ugly slum in places.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3708**



Reduce staff where possible.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

I don't think paywave technology is safe. Prefer separate AT card. Most local busses on the North Shore are empty so remove these buses.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Dynamic lanes. Good idea that work well on the bridge and the peninsula. Build an Eastern motorway.. rail link to airport.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Central rail link has been a money pit and has killed the cbd. It's a joke like the light rail ideas. Don't spend more money on these.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

It's worth keeping but using more efficiently

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#3708**



**Tell us why:**

More rates rises. Taking our money when cost of living is very high. No!

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Makes sense

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

A multipurpose waterfront stadium would really improve the cbd and would mean Eden Park could be greatly downsized as is in a residential area.



#3708



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#3708



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#3708



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

More important issues are coastal protection including rock walls and restoration of walkways. Also more protection of trees against ugly infill housing that will turn us into acslum

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Not sure. See comment above



**#3708**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Protect historic buildings and trees. They are unique and priceless.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Transportation

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3725**



- Maori development
- Cultural development
- Stadium maintenance
- Environmental Management
- Ecosystem and species protection

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Capped at weekly/monthly passes and easier to pay are not necessary, unless weekly/monthly passes are more cheaper than current rate as the current monthly passes are only beneficial to those who travel in very long distance and crossing multiple area in one way but not beneficial to others who lives nearby.

Think more about what really creating value and impacting public' everyday life but not focusing on certain group of Aucklanders ONLY

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Happy to pay more on the frequency of local transportation and traffic management on busy hours.

Which are most impactful to public everyday lives

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Weekly passes unless it is cheaper than current rate to the public which just across one-two areas

Consultation fees - could be lesser



**#3725**



### **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

#### **Tell us why:**

The northshore stadium has least value compared with other stadium in NZ, not necessarily to keeping it as it is, rather change operational management to reconsider how to best use the stadium eg. The music concert etc. which attracts more ppl to come to North Shore

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

#### **Tell us why:**

Not seeing any value from this proposal, as Auckland Council management should have own awareness on how to executing the funding policies. Why need a new group of people to manage it on behalf of Auckland Council? Isn't Auckland Council should just improve its own governance system??

### **4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

#### **Tell us here:**

Anything works to let me pay lesser rate regards to this

### **4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#3725



Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Anything works to let me pay lesser rate regards to this

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Not necessarily to make any changes unless Council have clear plan on how to develop this port before proposing the transfer, not just saying “to be used for something else”

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Not necessarily to make any changes unless Council have clear plan on how to develop this port before proposing the transfer , not just saying “to be used for something else”

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	Do not support
---	----------------



#3725



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Do not support



#3725



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Less spending on consultation service by negotiating the consultancy fees to reduce it to the level with more appropriate costs

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Not Important



#3725



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Not seeing these plan as too priorities creating most value

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Spend budget wisely and reasonably on correct things. The new skateboard park in takapuna central is a joke thinking of unreasonable cost spent on the renovation but came out with least value.

Please think about what the residents really need the most.

New library also not necessarily as current library fine as it is. This is creating unnecessary resources at our costs which has less values.

Rather spend money to improve current library facilities with lesser cost but at least bring values to the public

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Some proposals are not creating much value to Aucklander

Auckland Council have to really think why Aucklander always pay more price compared with other cities but dont really see much advantages arising from it. Other cities do better work than Auckland but with lesser price paid by their residents.



**#3725**



Poor local transportation and traffic management, redundant resources, low efficiency and effectiveness on endless road maintenance which spends long time to be completed.

And unclear proposal on port etc.

what means to be used for something else? How the public can agree with this without a clear picture from the council but asked to pay for it upfront. This is really a joke.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less Maori language. Very few new Zealanders can understand the language and it’s confusing having signs double up both languages.



**#3743**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Signage with Māori and English. Too confusing and too many words on a sign that needs to be simple and clear for way finding

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#3743



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#3743



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3743



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Very Important



#3743



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3761**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Building resilient transport infrastructure

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Don't want to waste the capital investment to date, without losing too much money

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Keeping assets as is, likely to maintain our strategic investments. Too easy to rob a the fund by new Councils in the future.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other



#3761



Tell us here:

Transfer the port to Manukau harbour. Develop existing port and sell off some commercial elements to fund the Manukau port development.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Do not support



#3761



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know



#3761



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Fairly Important



#3761



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Cohesive plan that allows current delivery of necessary services to support the community.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

New traffic safety rules do not appear to have increased traffic safety, but have definitely reduced transport efficiency.

The current programming of most traffic lights in the region does not increase traffic flow through intersections. Frequently traffic is stopped at red lights for many seconds while there is no traffic flowing where the light is green. This adds to frustration and drivers taking risks, such as running reds and making driving less safe.

Rather than just allowing land bank holders on the fringes of the city getting enormous value uplifts from forced zoning changes, they should have to somehow contribute some of this value uplift to Council. Eg if a land owner seeks a zoning change that increases the value of their land, then they have to back pay 20 years worth of rates based on the new zone less a credit for what rates they have paid.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

more work on keeping the beaches clean/ environment nice.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3779**



Stop wasting money on raised vehicle crossing and removing carparks which we don't want let along pay for.

Stop wasting money on so much red tape, do things more efficiently

Remove waste in head office not the services we use.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

please completely stop wasting money on raised pedestrian crossing and unused cycle ways and removing carparks and other money wasting policies that remove benefit to the community at huge cost

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Better roading and public transport.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycle ways/ pedestrian crossing/ removing car parks.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

Not used very much. Very expensive.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#3779**



**Tell us why:**

Good for the council to diversify their assets.

We should be moving the port to Northport and Port of Tauranga for a lot of the functions to free up the land. This will release more money than selling the port.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Overall for a private operator to pay more for the port that means the pricing needs to increase. I think better to be in public ownership but run efficiently unlike in the past. Also retaining ownership allows for the orderly removal of Port of Auckland activities out of Auckland.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Ultimately the asset stays the same value to makes sense to use it now rather than later.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Self insurance is a good option to save money but obviously need to cover very major events.



#3779



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

I strongly support Captain Cook and Marsden Wharves and Bledisloe Terminal being removed from the port and their activities to be moved to North Port and Port of Tauranga. More public space plus commercial activities/ apartments is best use of the land.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

This area needs to be transferred to the council. 15 years is too long... earlier the better but in a rational way.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3779



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#3779



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important



#3779



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Not Important

**Tell us why**

Please focus on running core services well and stop wasting money on arts and removing carparks and silly painted concrete pipes near car park building. Destroying main Takapuna road carparks a disgrace.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Very poor. Please focus on keeping beaches and our environment clean and tidy and core services

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

There is a place for increased intensification. However, this does put strains on existing infrastructure. Auckland Council should be considering intensifying in areas that have appropriate infrastructure, and investing in infrastructure to support future intensification where existing infrastructure cannot cope. A clear example is Lake Road in Devonport - one lane in and out for cars is not sufficient in my view for



#3784



intensification. In some cases targeted rates increases so it is paid for by local residents would be welcomed if it results in solutions and is only in place until the infrastructure is paid off.

Get ferry more regular and reliable. Cease allowing cruise ships to dock between 6am and 9am, and 4.30pm and 7.30pm as these are key commuter times. Public transport is a mess and makes Auckland look third world and this puts more people onto roads which cannot handle more traffic.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Libraries and other public services that are not well used (shut down some so the remaining have better patronage and make more sense). Far less Council executives and council administration costs would also be appropriate in my view.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Need more public transport, not less. Rather than worrying about the fuel tax, actually cut wasteful spending. Reduce council headcount, remove road cones, dont allow roading staff to work slowly just to obtain overtime rates, shut underused facilities. Redeploy this waste into useful investments.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Ferries and roading.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Council staff, underused facilities, stop paying any road contractor overtime (which just incentivises slow work).

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know



**#3784**



**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Move the entire port elsewhere. Its the most valuable land in the country. Redevelop into a vibrant waterfront precinct with apartment buildings you can sell to fund the work.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Auckland future fund would just be wasted by future councils. Public sector do not know/understand how to invest and spend appropriately. Better to privatise the port and retain a 40% shareholding.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#3784



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3784



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna



#3784



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

#### Tell us why

These are all wasteful spending areas. The key issues facing the area are (a) continue ferry reliability and frequency and (b) lake road being one lane each direction. Solve



**#3784**



these two issues and you will have done an awesome job - everything else is minor.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Ferries timeliness and reliability and solving the lake road issue (2 lanes each way at a minimum from Esmonde to Bayswater Ave).

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3797**



No restoration of Puketutu Island, review changes proposed for libraries, sponsor fewer events and festivals.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

More efficient to use existing pay wave payment systems, no need for in house development of hop card or issuing own card.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Excessive use of traffic management systems, particularly the proximity of sets of raised speed humps and traffic lights to each other on main arterial routes

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

Good facility always under utilized. Focus on improving and increasing the use of the facility within the community and wider city. Paid for by the community and ratepayers should be put into fresh hands to give it a go.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

### **Tell us why:**



**#3797**



More fiscally prudent to have this managed separately, set the expectations of the fund with the fund managers. Professionally managed - diverse portfolio.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Unlock capital to invest.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Prudent use of assets, build a fund

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

No change as the drop in revenue is significant. Review at later date when council is in a stronger financial position.



#3797



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

No change as the drop in revenue is significant. Review at later date when council is in a stronger financial position.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#3797



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#3797



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	I don't know
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Support the art partners as a way to bring visitors to the centres, otherwise you are paying twice if you are also intending to investing in key events.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Support the sale of under performing assets if there has been a proper evaluation of the performance undertaken first.



**#3797**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More cycling and walking infrastructure, new ferries.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3828**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I support continued investment in public transport and network optimization. I do not support stopping raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycling, walking and public transport.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Road maintenance and renewal that is not integrated with safety and walking and cycling upgrades. Work on the roads needs to be more integrated and efficient.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

### Tell us why:

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:

### 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



**#3828**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#3828



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#3828



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	I don't know



#3828



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Transport is the biggest priority for the area but is missing.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

It is not clear how Council's climate goals will be met from this plan, or how transport issues will be resolved.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3831**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

There's no mention of effect of the predicted increase in population on transport. I couldn't find any detail on the Auckland Housing Programme areas, but I would hope it proposes building more intensive housing in areas that are close to public transport networks and to the jobs and amenities people will use. Nobody in Auckland thinks they'll get by without a car and the current government's madcap plans to waste billions making traffic worse can only add to the chaos.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Has anybody researched the effect of traffic signals on traffic flow? I have numerous examples of crazy signal configurations holding up traffic. Are there any signals the could together be synchronised to improve flow? Start small with one intersection and build from there. If Christchurch can do it...

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

If it's underutilised, redevelop into something more useful.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#3831**



Previously, I've supported keeping the airport shares, but tough times need the tough calls. It's not core business anyway, so sell the distraction.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Seems like the better financial option.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Potential for extra returns.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Maximising the use of this land to make the existing public access even better and the potential to gain revenue from its use in the future.



#3831



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

We can afford to take a wait and see approach for this, surely.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#3831



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Events, parks and arts are things which are public good, part of a vibrant city and need funding.

Transport is horrific for a city of our size. This needs funding at pace. Not just talking about.



**#3852**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Efficiency not doing less and paying less. Paying less per transaction but getting more should be the focus. This may require capital investment in technology etc - there needs to be a focus on the efficiency and effectiveness of services not just paying less.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think cycleways provision alongside public transport is important.

Raised pedestrian crossings are a waste

we should be able to pay with public transport using our phones / bank cards like they can in Sydney. ATHop system is antiquated.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public Transport & Cycleways

Public Transport to Auckland Airport as Auckland's second largest employment district.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#3852**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

I think the port should move away from downtown Auckland.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#3852



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#3852



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#3852



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	I don't know
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Longterm carpark buildings at major public transport nodes.

And make public transport free or almost free - think \$3 per trip



**#3875**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Automate as many tasks as possible so organisation's like AT are smaller in number.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Rapid public transport... do less or the same suburban public transport but do more on connecting major transport hubs across the city (not just to the city centre). Build carpark buildings at this public transport hubs.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Ports of Auckland. - sell the asset.

The over the next ten years invest/increase ownership in Northport and a North of Auckland inland port.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#3875**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#3875



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#3875



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#3875



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3898**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#3898



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#3898



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#3898



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna,Rodney

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	



#3898



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	
--	--

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

## Rodney Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	



#3898



Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3906**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#3906



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3906



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#3906



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important



#3906



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I would pay more for the council to be more efficient. Auckland council service is appalling. Auckland council is over staffed for the services it provides. If you would like a great Auckland stop the red tape.

My family would pay more for council to hire competent staff, not career council workers!



**#3915**



Auckland has almost had enough and Aucklanders are getting to the stage where we can't afford to run your ballooning council.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop spending our money to try and be property developers, you've proved time and again you are not capable to do so.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stop the insane traffic management and death by cone to all. It also slows development.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Competent and EXPERIENCED staff to execute roading infrastructure to free up Auckland

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

insane traffic management for building work... Auckland is the laughing stock of NZ and the world

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#3915**



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Aucklanders can't afford to feed their families. Insane spending on council services and 'horse has bolted' natural disaster initiatives will result in worse problems like homelessness, more crime and further breakdown of the family. NO, to MORE SPENDING!!!!!!!!!!

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Because 100s of organisations could do it better. It might avoid more deaths for works and the port and also the poor chap who was run over by the pilot boat that cut the corner around north head and nothing was ever done about it. The poor widow and her children are now destitute.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Use it to lower rates so people can feed their families

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#3915



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

This survey is a typical council initiative.... Overly long winded.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	I don't know



#3915



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Sort your Building consent process out. Incompetent staff, horrendous accounts department. The only thing council does right here is sending surveys on “how did we do” what a joke. Auckland has had enough of the council department, sort it out!!

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#3915**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Auckland council staff.....PLEASE ORGANISE YOURSELVES in order to provide a better service to ratepayers



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Build more cycleways so that people at least have the option to commute and feel safe while doing so.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3918**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycleways are super important to reduce traffic and encourage people to move.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycleways

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#3918



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

I don't know



#3918



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#3918



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	I don't know
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Very Important



#3918



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3947**



Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#3947



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Do not support



#3947



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Do not support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Do not support



#3947



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	



#3947



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3994**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#3994



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#3994



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#3994



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important



#3994



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Roads for cars & general upkeep of parks

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4017**



Less money to AT if they are going to continue making driving around Auckland more difficult. AT's obsession with speed bumps, traffic lights & pedestrian crossings on roundabouts is destroying traffic flow.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The 3 points sound good; however, AT needs some serious checks & balances in place. They have happily wasted millions of dollars over the last few years & I have no confidence in them changing that. I believe their current executive need a complete clean out & people with a whole new attitude need to be put in there.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Synchronising traffic lights to facilitate traffic flow.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycle lanes, speed bumps, pedestrian crossings & traffic lights

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It's a fairly new stadium & it should be utilised better. If it's not fit for purpose, why was it even built?

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#4017**



**Tell us why:**

Auckland Council needs to reduce debt by freeing up cash in non-core businesses

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Again, not a core business but should keep ownership of land - leave the business risk to someone else

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Council services seem like a black hole

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**



#4017



Should be able to be income producing if the land is leased at a market rate.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Again, should income producing

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#4017



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I don't know



#4017



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Priorities

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Don't know



**#4017**



8. Do you have any other comments?

No



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Rapid and extensive increase in safe cycling transport options(especially low-cost interventions). Support for communities, support for the environment.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4033**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Need to find ways of raising money to improve congestion, air quality, public transport frequency and reliability, and safety for cyclists and pedestrians.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Improving congestion, air quality, public transport frequency and reliability, and safety for cyclists and pedestrians. There are interventions available that achieve all of these aims if the funding is there.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Subsidising car transport and car-dependent housing development.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

We do not need this stadium. Use this land for community sports infrastructure or sell to raise funds for other sports infrastructure in the city.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



**#4033**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Begin a transfer plan to free up Port of Auckland land for development (e.g. a 15,000-20,000 seat rectangular stadium, or housing).

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#4033



e.g. a 15,000-20,000 seat rectangular stadium, or housing/mixed-use development

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#4033



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Albert-Eden,Devonport-Takapuna

## Albert-Eden Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Albert-Eden in 2024/2025?**

I don't know

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Celebrating different people and cultures, bringing people together with fun and engaging activities, and reducing barriers for those who might struggle to connect with council or others in the community.	Very Important
Continuing our environmental work through tree planting, parks restoration, supporting	Very Important



#4033



volunteer pest control and planting groups and helping community climate action through our Climate Activator.	
Planning for how our parks and open space can respond to growth, making the most of what we have, balancing different uses and connecting green spaces together.	Very Important
Supporting our community groups with funding, information, learning new skills and building their capability and networks.	Very Important
Settling in at the new, medium-term location for the Pt Chevalier library and continuing to investigate what the long-term library solution might be and how we will fund it.	Very Important
Working with the community on activations in the Mt Albert Civic Square.	Very Important
Making our parks rubbish-bin free to minimise waste and improve environmental and climate outcomes.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Albert-Eden proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
--	--------------



#4033



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4034**



Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

No money for such luxuries

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#4034



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	I don't know



#4034



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#4034**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Push for second harbour crossing.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

N/A



**#4064**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need to reduce costs.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Tourism promotion.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

N/A

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

N/A

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

N/A

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#4064**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

N/A

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

N/A

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

N/A

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

N/A

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#4064



Tell us why:

N/A

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4064



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

N/A

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna,Henderson-Massey

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
--	----------------



#4064



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

N/A

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

N/A

**Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?**

Very Important



#4064



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	Very Important
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	Very Important
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	Very Important
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	Very Important
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	N/A

Tell us why

N/A

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

N/A



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Spend money on organising Preventative Detention workers to work for free cleaning up rubbish and maintenance.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4069**



Paying for events. Just stop it. They should be self sustaining or not at all.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

I support stopping some of the proposed plans. NZ is too small to make cycling a viable option. Its dangerous and we are not China yet.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Remove tolls. If you can't afford to do it dont do it. Where will it end?

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Paying for road workers to stand around. I know everyone complains about this but actually, its because its true. They need to work more efficiently and be in and out. Ive seen it first hand outside my house putting in pedestrian crossing that took a year to go in and hours of people standing around.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct,Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

Its there now. Just use it on something useful. Fire the people that organised it in the first place. Stop building recreation places and look at what people who are really struggling need. We dont need to keep up with other countries.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#4069**



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

It will just be another thing that won't work. Also, don't sell shares in AIAL. Who to? That's what worries me.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

We need to keep control

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

We need funds now obviously.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Please stop calling it 'Future Fund' Its jargon. Just call it savings that we are investing. And make sure you invest in the right entities.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations



#4069



Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

Gives time to decide what its best use would be.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Support



#4069



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

You cant keep putting up the rates. People are really struggling. Fix water and rubbish. Tip fees are ridiculous and this means more people will be dumping rubbish

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#4069**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

So much of this stuff is common sense and even discussing it at this stage is just keeping people in a job. Stop with the roading. If it takes longer for people to get somewhere so be it. Stop paying for stupid events.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Get waste water out of our beaches. This is a very hot topic!

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4131**



Worry less about racial and political issues. Focus more on tangible results where it's needed

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Our public transport is getting better but still embarrassingly unreliable and under resourced. We can't keep building houses with 0-1 car parks and not have more public transport.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More on trains, bus and stations. The stations should be focal points of the community with shops, accommodation etc.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

"Community" is the backbone of any society. Kiwis love sports and need quality, well managed stadiums to enjoy sport and events together. A happy and connected society is a well functioning society.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#4131**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#4131



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4131



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#4131



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Support all people, not just iwi or ethnic. It's ridiculous and racist.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Manage homelessness and beggars. Manage community security as robberies and increasing every week

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

less meeting and consultation and start putting your head on something already on the Paper!



**#4137**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#4137



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
---	-----------------------



#4137



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#4137



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	



#4137



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Maintaining libraries and community centers; reliable public transportation

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4138**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Continuing to invest in walkways

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Establishing an Auckland Future fund seems like a good idea but I don't agree with the sale of the airport shares

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#4138



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#4138



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4138



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Fairly Important



#4138



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4139**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The only way to remove congestion on our roads is by offering a reliable, sustainable and cost effective public transport system.

I am a Northcote Point resident and I am acutely aware of the challenges of Onewa Road - challenges that could be reduced significantly with dynamic lanes

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

NHS has the potential to become a small boutique venue but since it fell under the control of the current management structure it has totally lost its way - it needs investment based on a clear plan for its future use with input from those groups who will actually be using it. It is too valuable a resource to lose - once its gone it isn't ever coming back!!

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It just makes sense and is the only way forward towards a sustainable Auckland City



**#4139**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

See above - also running ports should not be a function of Council

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Rates should fund Council services the Future Fund should be exactly that a fund that can create a fully sustainable city

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#4139



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#4139



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Kaipātiki

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide	Very Important



#4139



decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

The management of our parks is in crisis mode and is a major handbrake on people being able to train and play sport. In short there are not enough playing fields to meet the demand placed on them.

We need more fields but we also need better management of these resources with direct input from the clubs and organisations that use them.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Howick Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?**



#4139



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	
Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses.	
Develop a community-led climate action plan.	
Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I support all priorities



#4139



## Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Kaipātiki in 2024/2025?

Very Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs.	Fairly Important
Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community	Fairly Important
Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control.	Very Important
Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation.	Fairly Important
Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan.	Fairly Important



#4139



Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture.

As noted above there are not enough playing fields and what we have needs to be better managed with direct input from the clubs and sporting codes that use them.

Also the development of the protection work at Little Shoal Bay is well overdue

There needs t

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

The following comment is made as President of Takapuna FC

Takapuna FC is a football club based at Taharoto Park.

The club owns the clubrooms which are located on land leased from the Council.

The club has enjoyed access to the two playing fields that are located adjacent to the club and, for the most part, these two fields have provided sufficient space to accommodate our teams during the winter season.

However, as our membership grows, (17% increase in winter registrations since 2019) and we develop other football products such as, our Summer 5's and 7's competitions (200% increase in summer registrations since 2021), holiday programmes and academy activities we find that access to the current fields has become the single largest threat and impediment to the club's growth and sustainability.

Whilst Parks are high on Councils priorities it is vital that sports clubs, as well as their governing bodies, have a say in decisions on the use and management of these facilities and that in doing so there is a more strategic and evidenced based approach on usage.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Fix the pot holes in the roads and make Lake road wider

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Get rid of the trains trains they spend more time not working than working



**#4161**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Public transport will not work properly in Auckland never has problems with ferry's bus and trains you will never fixing it

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#4161



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

It is better for the port to stay in Auckland do not move it anywhere else

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

We. Need all the port space that we can

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#4161



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Do not support



**#4161**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4165**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Transport calming and safety around town centres and higher density residential areas are crucial. Please introduce speed reduction methods along Bracken Avenue in Takapuna (commercial side).

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Better utilise the significant areas of parking, enable higher mixed use developments and connecting by frequent public transport to Albany Station.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**



#4165



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4165



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#4165**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4171**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Bus trains and ferry's will never work properly as long AT is running them

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Fixing pot holes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#4171



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#4171



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Do not support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Do not support



#4171



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important



#4171



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#4182



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

We should stop paying grossly inflated price to build infrastructure. One just needs to compare estimates for the second harbour crossing & tunnel with some major infrastructure projects worldwide (for example Millau viaduct in France, 55 mile sea bridge in China) to realise that we have been fleeced by local construction firms. As a country of 5 million tax and rate payers our focus needs to be laser sharp to lower the cost of infrastructure delivery. If local construction firms cannot compete in terms of quality and cost we should not be using them. That simple.

Project delays and budget blowouts Auckland CRL style are not acceptable. Those that have made that possible should be held accountable.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

NH Stadium should be able to stand on its own feet commercially. If anything it should be returning dividends to the owner. Any further investment funded by ratepayers is not acceptable.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#4182**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Proposed rates increases are substantial and come at the time when people are struggling with cost increases across the board. Everything should be done to keep the rate increases minimal including significant cuts to AC services if necessary.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

With Vinyard and Viaduct developments there is already significant waterfront area available for public use. Use of these two wharves should therefore be prioritised to maximise value of PoA shareholders. If one day PoA is relocated or sold then these two



#4182



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#4182



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Fibre Cement Solutions Ltd

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do less
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I would actually like to see you doing the basics like keeping grass verges and public places maintained and mowed regularly.

You also need to stop selling off assets such as the Downtown Car Park if you want to keep the city alive - we do not like catching public transport in Auckland we love to get about freely on our own timetables. We need to be able to get back into the CBD



**#4184**



easily and have ample car parking. You are absolutely ruining our city. It is too hard to get into and find parking in, therefore we don't go there anymore. So, if that's your aim you have achieved it.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop these ridiculous 30km per hour zones for "safety". Takapuna is slowly dying with the one way street and lack of parking now. And to top it off you have introduced a 30km zone based on an Australian study. 50km to be bought back please.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Raised pedestrian crossings can definitely go. The bus lanes we have everywhere actually slow down and congest traffic. Taxi's and Ubers should be able to use bus lanes as should anyone with 4 people in their car. We ratepayers/tax payers have had vast sums of money be poured into this and it doesn't improve my life what so ever. How about you start thinking about the majority of the population of Auckland, who do use their vehicals.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It is an asset to our community. Get a great marketing team involved and start using the stadium for events other than sport as well as sport.



**#4184**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Happy for you to sell Airport Shares but not happy for you to sell Ports of Auckland. We need to have some assets as a city that are ours.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

We need to keep some assets. And the Port is extremely important not only to Auckland but to NZ ensuring Imports and Exports especially as we are an Island, along way from the rest of the world. Our Ports are where the bulk of imports and exports arrive and leave from.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

If this were my business I would want one of my assets to fund my other business interests - would make sense to. And keeps management accountable.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#4184



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Because the cost of bringing goods into the Port of Auckland is quicker and cost effective vs Whangarei or Tauranga and therefore beneficial to all New Zealanders.

And we have to bring in and export goods - we should keep the Port of Auckland alive and ex

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

As above.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#4184



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

I have spent an hour today looking for "(see page 98 in the consultation document) and some changes to fees and charges (page 100 in the consultation document)" The consultation document doesn't have this many pages in it. So, I've called and spoke to Nita, who couldn't find it either, so asked her manager who also couldn't find it so she



#4184



emailed this Team to ask them to urgently contact me - her words. It's now 3 hours later and I don't want to have to re-submit this whole document. You should have the link to the document above with the text. This is pretty poor all around. Please can you start doing things well. Not impressed at this end.

## Local board priorities

### 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important



#4184



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Protected cycle lanes and cycle infrastructure. Now!

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4189**



Carparks. Reduce now!

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

PT NOW!

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycle lanes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Carparks

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Not sure it works as is

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need to invest in our City



**#4189**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Don't sell the family silver

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

We need investment

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Decades of under investment have come home to roost. Great cities are built and maintained for people to use, not vehicles.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#4189



**Tell us why:**

Great cities use water fronts for people

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4189



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
--	----------------



#4189



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Because we're a community which needs investment

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Gather revenue and invest (tax and spend) it's the only way forward



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4233**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#4233



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#4233



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#4233



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	I don't know
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important



#4233



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Rethink Lake Road on the North Shore, eg use some of the unnecessarily wide footpath as part of the cycle lane; institute dynamic lanes

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4243**



Bureaucracy

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The City Rail Link will not solve the bigger problems Auckland faces. More lateral thinking is required about how to optimise traffic flow. There are potential efficiency gains from focusing on key bottlenecks and using what we have more efficiently, eg wider use of dynamic lanes

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

See above

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

See above

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#4243**



I don't believe that a fund manager can outperform the return the Council can make by owning shares in unregulated natural monopolies (AIAL and Port of Auckland Ltd). Additionally, I don't believe it's in the interest of Aucklanders to lose control of those assets through their privatisation as both the port and the airport are unregulated monopolies and will be free to monopoly price which entails a loss of economic welfare and efficiency.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I support releasing capital to the city and reducing the rates increase while not relinquishing long term control of the port and while also managing it to a degree via conditions in the lease.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

There will be a margin charged by professional fund managers of the Auckland Future Fund which represents a cost to the ratepayer without any guarantee that the fund manager can or will outperform the returns from the existing monopolies to the Council.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#4243



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

I suspect that if you transfer Capt Cook and Marsden wharves and take them out of port operations you will create a medium term demand for expansion of the Bledisloe terminal which will create cost increases and be environmentally adverse and have a negat

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

I think that over the 15 year time frame and treating the Bledisloe Terminal at the same time as Marsden and Capt Cook wharves a holistic solution that enhances amenity and environmental values for Auckland harbour areas and suburbs can be found. This will necessitate rethinking and probably downsizing the port operations in that location and finding a more appropriate location for them. This is an opportunity to create prosperity.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	Support



#4243



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#4243



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important



#4243



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

All these things are nice to have but secondary in importance to covering the basics such as roads and toilets that work and rubbish bins that are where they are needed and regularly emptied. Eg unblock Lake Road.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

A link to the relevant pages would be helpful here.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Links to relevant pages would be helpful.

Would prefer to see Council and Community Boards stick to the basics of making sure things are clean and function properly. I do support revitalising our town and local centres and making them fun places to visit. To make this work car parking must be easily accessed and affordable.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Invest in Parks infrastructure to support and protect the environment. This includes stormwater management, improved tracks and walkways, shared paths for alternative means of transportation, and more weed and pest control.



**#4247**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less events and openings etc. Support private events with ease of permissions/consents/approvals to make events less costly and difficult for industry to provide at low/no cost to the public.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Great that there is a plan to integrate public transport.

It would be great to continue to invest in active transport modes. Does the Council consider path through parks rather than along roads. These look to be more cost effective than getting involved with road issues.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Active transport modes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Less paperwork, business cases and trial projects and more money spent on actually getting projects done.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

This appears to be an under utilised asset which could be sold and used better by a private owner with a higher incentive to use the asset.



**#4247**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

AIAL shareholding is a great long-term investment for council and shouldn't be sold for perceived short-term gains.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

POAL shareholding is a great long-term investment for council and shouldn't be sold for perceived short-term gains.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Auckland Future Fund is a new innovative and as such should get funding from new sources or excess income rather than taking money from other parts of Council.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#4247



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

If the wharves are to be removed from the POAL then they need to return at least the same \$300 million that would be lost. There is no point leaving empty, windswept, concrete wharfs as "public space" like Queens Wharf and Princess Wharf for a loss of inc

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

The public benefit needs to be access to the harbour but also financial. There is no point in getting rid of assets to create more costs and then having to increase rates due to poor decision making.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4247



Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Pay as you throw is a much better system as it should incentivize people to reduce their waste.



#4247



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important



#4247



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Great to see making room for water and more environmental focus.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Brilliant basics waste, roads, water...forget all the other nice to haves



**#4260**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stopping all raised ped crossing focus on getting Auckland moving and faster

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Festivals, events etc

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Not utilised enough,

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Sell all shares

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



#4260



Tell us here:

100% it needs to profitable

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

We need significant investment in water access not more residential development or public spaces

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#4260



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	



#4260



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Remove food waste collection unless profitable

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support any priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Not Important



#4260



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Roads, transport and coastal community development

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Water access and ferry services and roading are the only 3 priorities



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Infrastructure improvements to pipes to prevent leaking

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Much events for nothing



**#4289**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

dynamic line will lead to more distraction

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

keeping sidewalks safe

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Urbanizing more and more - stop town houses without garages as it is not practical

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

More bureaucracy and not enough actions to reduce it. With so much current debt it is not visible.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#4289**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Port just started operating properly. Do not smash it now, May be after 10 years.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

repay the current debt faster

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#4289



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#4289



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

By rising rates support these local areas who paying them. Not good to see your rates going to other part of Auckland and your area worsening.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide	



#4289



decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Needs more budget

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4313**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#4313



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#4313



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#4313



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important



#4313



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Public transport fares reduced to one third of current levels

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Any management planning is ineffective and must be done less.



**#4341**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

In addition to transportation, other aspects should reduce expenditure, especially managers

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#4341



Tell us here:

It is more efficient to be run by a private company

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

I don't know



#4341



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



**#4341**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More reporting against people numbers and measurable KPIs by department. There is no where in this survey, so far, where the efficiency of Council is addressed. My observations working with Council is that there is massive opportunity to remove cost, which would help deliver better outcomes at existing rating levels.



**#4353**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less excessive traffic management requirement around what are relatively minor road works.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The raised pedestrian crossings and unused cycleway expansion has to stop!

Auckland is a road access city - we need this infrastructure to function. It doesn't do this very well at all. Raised pedestrian crossings frustrate flow as do cycle ways...and how many pedestrians were killed on painted zebra crossings in the last 20 years?

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Removing bottle neck points on key road routes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

As above - cycle ways and raised pedestrian crossings

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It is a relatively new facility and before destroying or remodelling it, I think it is incumbent on Council to try a new management approach...external to Council

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#4353**



Other

**Tell us why:**

The problem with any such fund is its management. Who is going to manage the fund and are they going to outperform AIA? I think we should leave the airport alone at present and just use the dividend...I doubt any fund will exceed the proportionate return of the AIA investment either in capital growth or % p.a. The option to sell at a later date if needed will always be there...but for a specific major infrastructural gain...not for a fund.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

35 years is too longer lease for such a critically important piece of land

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

I'm unconvinced re the Auckland Future Fund

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#4353



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

I have some hesitancy here - this area of Auckland’s waterfront is PRIME and ultimately should be developed as a draw card for the City and be used by the Public.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Ditto re the above...we need to phase out part of the wharf activities and phase in more public use of this part of the port

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	



#4353



Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#4353



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important



#4353



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Not Important

**Tell us why**

Council like Government should be small and efficient with clear boundaries, I shouldn't be growing in its reach and influence on our lives

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I worry about how this will translate to more staff being employed and more interaction and influence in our lives. Council exists because ratepayers exist and pay rates for key services...not so that Councils can grow in size and reach

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I think I've said enough, that if you read and take notice you will very much understand my message, which I have to say is similar to that that many ratepayers I have spoken with would agree. However I doubt many will work their way through this document....despite it being a VERY GOOD effort of engagement - thank you.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Significant increase in connectivity for walking and cycling to the key busways and train stations, so that it is easier to use active transport in combination with public transport. Increase funding for the arts.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4364**



Less investment in festivals and events. Less investment in pointless squares paved in concrete like the one in Takapuna.

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I like the investment in more public transport. But stopping cycling initiatives leaves the city with piecemeal networks. If you want people to cycle, there is not point in small sections of cycle lanes that don't connect up, which forces bikes back into traffic.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More on active transport connectivity between sections of the cycleways and between cycleways/walkways and busways, and trains.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

It's only used by a few teams rather than the community as a whole. It is underutilised.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

### Tell us why:



**#4364**



I'm not convinced selling the assets is the best long-term move.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

This would balance the usefulness of keeping the container port operations but allow some greater public use of the waterfront.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#4364



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support



#4364



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is a big mistake to stop "pay as you throw" rubbish charges. It is vital that the people who produce the most waste pay, rather than sharing the cost of their production of rubbish with those who are making more effort to reduce waste and recycle more through rate increases.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#4364



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

They must find other ways for fulfilling their budget. It is very easy simply to rise rates. Nothing to think about. Just sit down, relax and count profit.

Why don't they consider their salaries reduction?



**#4393**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop rising prices! Find alternative ways for covering your debts.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The way to \*\*\*\*\* is paved by good will. You simply covering your budget debts. Nothing will change except we will have to pay more.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No!

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Rates.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Why should I spend my money for other people sport activities?

Let sporty people to pay for their hobbies.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#4393**



**Tell us why:**

Why should we sell our values because of other people bad management?

We need to ask them where the money is.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Stop selling our values! Find alternative ways for getting more money.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

As above

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

They try to create This Future Fund for selling Auckland values to other people or companies. Who is the beneficiary? We must watch this very careful.

There might be a criminal component.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations



#4393



**Tell us why:**

As above

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4393



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Almost all questions are related to sell or not to sell huge amount of Auckland Council shares. Stop selling our values!

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna



#4393



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	I don't know
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

#### Tell us why

### 7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



**#4393**



Have no clue/

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

We must monitor the way they are trying to sell council shares.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4412**



Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#4412



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
---	-----------------------



#4412



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4412



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Not Important



#4412



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Increase spend on Transport. Reduce the size of buses in proportion to occupancy.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4421**



Reduce unnecessary spend on highlighting council achievements. Why wastes thousands on a flyer showing how much saved through food waste collection? The people are already adapting, instead spend that on areas where the adoption is less.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Lollipop workers are not needed at the remote places. Place proper sign, people will understand. Stop spending money on cones. Pedestrian crossings can be built in a week, do not spend months to build.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Optimising the signals across the network to allow for better traffic flow. Install traffic cameras and fine the speedsters and the illegal bike riders

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised Pedestrian crossings.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

### **Tell us why:**



**#4421**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

The projected inflation

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Dont take more responsibility than you can handle and end up wasting money



#4421



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#4421



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#4421



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

As a local board, focus on delivering services to residents. Let the central government focus on Culture and Ethnic priorities.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Focus on delivering service. Refrain from engaging in promoting culture, ethnic etc. etc. NZ government has multicultural programs to support all culture and ethnicity.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#4434



Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

waste money but there is nothing really improve

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Update grade stormwater and waste water pipe

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Less money on Maori culture

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#4434



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#4434



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#4434**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Environmental restoration/protection and cultural development/support for the arts, events, grants for local boards - to encourage community involvement in the arts.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4438**



Focusing less on renovation of historical buildings, rather preserving them. Rushing into urban development - I want solutions to the housing crisis but not at the detriment of the environment.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

It makes sense to have a new focus on smaller-scale changes to more quickly improve performance of our roads and public transport services. I support getting more people using public transport to reduce emissions. I don't love the need for more paid parking but can understand the necessity from a different angle. It would be great to be able to pay fares on public transport using apple pay etc. and to introduce a weekly cap of public transport fees.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

An accelerated programme on ferry decarbonisation and accelerated rollout of low emission buses.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### **Tell us why:**

Personally I'm not sure of what really needs to be developed and how much of an impact this would make - I think there are many more important issues at hand.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#4438**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#4438



**Tell us why:**

It sounds like it would involve inconvenience and great costs to make the terminal into something else.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#4438



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Waitematā

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
--	--------------



#4438



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Waitematā Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitematā in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road.	Fairly Important
---	------------------



#4438



Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works.	I don't know
Phased delivery of improvements for Heard Park.	I don't know
Deliver services and programmes that support youth activation, leadership, and wellbeing, particularly in Newmarket.	Very Important
Develop programmes that improve perceptions of safety within the City Centre, and our town-centres.	Fairly Important
Support local communities to develop Emergency Planning & Readiness Response Plans.	Fairly Important
Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitemata including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Waitemata proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4467**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The North Shore needs to have a stadium that will be fit for the population growth expected in the coming years. The Stadium was built as a multi purpose stadium and foundations were installed so the stadium could be extended to increase its capacity. The electricity network around the stadium is more than adequate to hold large concerts. If the current capacity is considered more than enough use the terraces for leased retail or office space. The management of the stadium has clearly failed if it is incurring debt each year. Auckland council seems to go out of its way for Eden Park & Mount Smart Stadiums with little support focused on the North Shore. Proper marketing with a good management team. If proposal one or two was to be undertaken I could take a bet that it will be double any initial cost resulting in more debt. A proposed 10,000 capacity centre would soon become inadequate if the management team were able to secure games of all types, concerts and conferences in the existing building.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#4467**



**Tell us why:**

Short term fix with council and the community having limited control over its assets. Selling off AIAL shares and the leasing POAL appears to be a quick get out of debt fix. Auckland Council runs the risk of having no assets for its future. The rate payers will be hit with spiraling increased rates.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Similar situation to selling airport shares. Look at how the port is structured. Why give control away ?

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**



#4467



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#4467



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#4467



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

All of the listed items have merit.

The improvement to Parks seems to be about upgrading facilities and the grounds. No consideration for parking. Parking is a major issue around parks as they become more widely used. Safety issues and destruction of berms through lack of adequate parking is a major concern. Surely some of the space around the fields could be used for Parking ? ? ?

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#4467**



No Comment at this stage

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Main reason for filling this feedback in was North Harbour Stadium. It would be a backward step to demolish or significantly reduce the capacity of this stadium. Some really good management and significant marketing could make the stadium profitable. The council needs to support the Community on the North Shore by being more positive. The easy option is to knock it down and leave the shore with no decent stadium for its anticipated growth.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Mowing the grass more regularly in parks, develop town spaces eg Takapuna

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4498**



No

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Would prefer council to keep spending on cycleways and raised crossings

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycle ways, raised crossings and ferry services

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#4498**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Spend more money upgrading the port

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#4498



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#4498



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important



#4498



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4500**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Auckland needs to improve transport options

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Number of staff needs to be reduced

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Update and make more efficient

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#4500



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#4500



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#4500



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important



#4500



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No. You are already doing less with what rates you already get as per the previous budget.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4518**



Less renaming everything with dual Maori and English names. Just leave it as it is.  
Stop funding traffic cones and useless road crews. Fine them for taking long.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Clearly AT needs to come to the party as well as they are failing their mandate. Cancel all pedestrian crossings and bumps. Cancel inefficient and costly contracts.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No. Its already expensive.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Public transport. How dare the prices be raised to subsidise your lost fares because of inefficient maintenance and design.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

The stadium is sufficient and the redevelopment cost will undoubtedly exceed 33 million. And will then have to be maintained anyway with additional funds.

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#4518**



**Tell us why:**

Redistributing funds means acquiring expensive other assets. There is no clear path where Auckland residents may benefit. The climate change risk is not quantifiable and will only serve to bail out insurers that will keep on insuring uninsurable assets.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Retain ownership, lease out with Auckland citizen income protection, do not establish Auckland Future Fund.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

How dare you propose to half rubbish collection AND increase rates while reducing what can be recycled. Rethink this to the obvious solution.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

This council has not shown that projects of this complexity can be completed within budget and the benefits realised. Leave as is and let Cruise Ships dock there.



#4518



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

No clear plans seem to exist for this transfer. Until such time as “public benefit” can be properly and reliably defined, leave sleeping dogs lie.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4518



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

You heard me.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities



#4518



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Depends who your partners are and what the distribution is.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Get the waterways right. It’s a disgrace that we have sewerage in our waterways. We promote a clean green image and yet we have massive water issues and also have dozens of landfill which impacts waterways as well. Over invest in water infrastructure please!



**#4563**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Remove the bureaucracy and run council like an efficient business

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Need to connect the north shore to the city. No cycle or rail options for commuters is narrow minded

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Rail. Buses are constrained by capacity. Rail less so, particularly underground rail.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycle lanes. We're not a big cycle city due to weather and topography

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Remove it. Sell the assets and put towards a waterfront stadium

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#4563**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Investment and operational efficiencies

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Open up the waterfront

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#4563



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4563



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
--	----------------



#4563



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4575**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#4575



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#4575



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

[REDACTED]  
Marketing Manager  
Auckland Rugby League  
[REDACTED]

Dear Auckland City Council,

I am writing to you on behalf of Auckland Rugby League to express our strong support for the proposed increase in funding through the Sport and Recreation facilities Investment Fund (SRFIF) as outlined in Auckland Council's Long-term Plan 2024-2034. As a Regional Sport Organisation deeply invested in the growth and development of Rugby League in Auckland, we believe that the Long-term Plan (LTP) presents a crucial opportunity to shape the future of our sport and our communities.

As a key pillar in our strategy to 2030, Auckland Rugby League has been steadfast in our commitment to growing participation at all levels of the game. One of our proudest achievements has been the phenomenal growth we have witnessed in the girls and women's spaces within our sport. The number of female participants has surged, reflecting a growing demand for opportunities for girls and women to engage in Rugby League at both grassroots and elite levels.

However, as participation numbers continue to rise, so too does the need for fit-for-purpose facilities to accommodate this growth. This entails community Clubrooms, female changing rooms, sand carpeted fields, floodlit lighting. Adequate and accessible facilities are essential in providing safe and enjoyable playing experiences for our participants. Without suitable facilities, we risk hindering the development of Rugby League in Auckland and depriving our communities of the benefits that sport brings.

The proposed increase in capital funding for sport and recreation through the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund (SRFIF), is a welcome step towards addressing the infrastructure deficit that our sport faces. By investing in facilities that meet the needs of our growing participant base, we can ensure that rugby league remains a vibrant and inclusive sport for all Aucklanders.

As we look towards the future, Auckland Rugby League is committed to working collaboratively with Auckland Council to identify and prioritize the needs of our sport and our communities. We believe that by investing in fit-for-purpose facilities and supporting initiatives that promote participation, we can create a healthier, more active, and more connected Auckland.

In closing, I would like to extend our gratitude to Auckland Council for its ongoing support of rugby league in Auckland. Together, we can continue to make a positive impact on the lives of our participants and contribute to the thriving sporting landscape of our city.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and we look forward to the opportunity to further discuss how we can work together to achieve our shared goals.

Sincerely,



Marketing Manager  
Auckland Rugby League



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Supporting community groups to run local events. These have a much bigger impact on communities than funding large events

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4600**



Funding for major events. These are short term sugar rushes which do little to advance the well being of the community.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Cycleways and making areas pedestrian friendly rather than car centric will enhance the city.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

pedestrian friendly areas, walkways. Making it easy to get around without a car

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Less priority on the use of private vehicles.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### **Tell us why:**

The north shore needs a sports stadium. The outer oval would make a great test cricket venue which Auckland does not have. Christchurch, Tauranga, Hamilton, Wellington all have test cricket venues. Why not Auckland and North harbour stadium would be ideal.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#4600**



**Tell us why:**

At last a sensible proposal for the Auckland Airport shares. Of course the council as an investor should not have all its investments in on one company. I Support this proposal with gusto.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The council is not in the business of running commercial companies - the port being an example of this. History shows the council has been a poor operator of the port. Compare this to the publicly listed Tauranga port. Spreading the risk of the investment in the Future Fund is a great idea.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Best of a bad decision. Please don't keep operating the port.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#4600



**Tell us why:**

Would be good to have better access to the waterfront as it enhances the beauty of Auckland City.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

it is too much money and more road transport is the last thing we need.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4600



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?



#4600



I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

A community hub in Takapuna is just in the wrong place. Thinking of Takapuna as a hub is just not the 2024 Takapuna . Takapuna was a hub 40 years ago - today it is a small residential area with some tired strip shops and a small mall. The focus on key events concerns me as this will be at the expense of many smaller community events. Key events are expensive and provide very short sugar rushes. Smaller community events engage the local community more as they more frequent and usually involve



**#4600**



local people in the organisation and delivery.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Overall the priorities are general and wide ranging - does not really inspire or show an overall direction. You could fit almost anything into the broad words used.

I would like to see a specific mention of supporting community groups to run local events. These are so important in creating connected communities.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

The change in the local board funding policy puts too much emphasis on population and ignores the asset base local boards need to maintain. The reality is people living in Auckland move around the city to make use of facilities in areas outside of their local board area. There is a risk that existing facilities will be poorly maintained. The emphasis on population needs to be reduced and funding provided based more on need which includes the asset base and land area.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

local events are nice to have but should be privately funded when we have priorities such as water quality issues and transportation needs. Focus on the basics. I'm sure people would pay \$5 to come watch a movie in a park.



**#4716**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Public transport and free ways of travelling e.g. cycling should be a priority. We need less cars on the road.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raise pedestrian crossings, the feedback has been overwhelming from community groups and FENZ. This is a driver education issue.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### Tell us why:

This has not been managed well. Eden Park is a prime example of what happens when you have great event organizers in place. Making Harbour Stadium attractive and affordable for more events to be at should be a priority.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:

Auckland Airport is an asset that needs to be protected



**#4716**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#4716



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#4716



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Upper Harbour

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#4716



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Back to basics should be priority while people are struggling with the cost of living.  
Have user pays for events.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#4716



Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**



**#4716**



**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Continued improvements to the frequency, reliability and accessibility (for disabled people with a variety of mobility, cognitive and sensory impairments) of public transport is absolutely essential. As well as bus, train and ferry service and infrastructure improvements, there must be a greater focus on footpath maintenance



**#4749**



and upgrades, especially in the central city around key bus stops e.g. opposite AUT in Mayoral Drive and the Hospital stop on Tyler street. These two locations are a health & safety hazard to all.

improvements to environmental protection especially harbour water quality so beaches are safe to swim. Continued focus on mitigating and adapting to climate change is essential.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Limit focus on major sports events to those which really deliver a benefit to community and business. These events seldom deliver the benefits they promise. More focus on community events across the city from the far north to the south of the council area.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Raised pedestrian crossings improve safety for children, older people and disabled people, in fact all who choose to walk around the city. This programme should not be reduced and should continue in conjunction with continued roll out of slower speed zones around schools and in shopping areas. Very disappointed to see end of fuel tax if this means planned network improvements are in jeopardy, eg completion of Eastern busway.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Footpath maintenance and widening, on road cycleways to improve cyclist safety and remove cyclists from footpaths (which they will continue to use illegally if they do not feel safe).

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Major roading projects which do not also deliver walking/cycling safety improvements.



#4749



### 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

#### Tell us why:

I do not support the sale of council owned land around the stadium. If it is under-used this is likely due to poor marketing, or high cost of use. The stadium is close to a major transport hub so it's use should be maximised and optimised to provide the North Shore community with a quality sports and cultural facility. I do not support redevelopment as this will likely cost even more and take time to deliver any real benefits.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

#### Tell us why:

This is better than selling the shares.

### 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

#### Tell us here:

I do not support the leasing plan. This would put the port operations under foreign control which I believe is unacceptable for an essential strategy national asset. New Zealand is a trading nation wholly dependent on importing and exporting, and Auckland is a major gateway for this economic activity. It is good that Auckland Council benefits from this activity.



**#4749**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Somewhat supportive of this proposal.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Auckland Council must maintain ownership of the Port land and should not be divesting any land as this land was acquired for the benefit of future generations and would be impossible to get back once sold.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

I do not trust Auckland Council to use this land for public space. It is more likely to sold off to developers for poor returns and unnecessary development on the waterfront.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Support this only if public space use is guaranteed.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#4749



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#4749



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#4749



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Community facility improvements are important. Also important is continued advocacy for Bayswater ferry terminal, cycleway on Bayswater Avenue to support active transport to 4 plus schools in area and Lake Road improvements to improve the reliability of public transport and encourage reduced sole occupancy vehicle use between Devonport and Takapuna

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Mostly supportive

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

It is disappointing that the 10 year plan offers little for disabled and older people, a growing population especially in our local board area. The Enabling Good Lives approach should ensure that disabled people can participate in all aspects of their



**#4749**



community. It is disappointing that Auckland Council does not collect demographic information related to disability.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4752**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

I dont want to see the port leased to a foreign investor while we are all working hard to provide our own council with a return that ultimately services the needs of our city that WE live in. I can tell you now that a foriegn investor will not have our employees best



#4752



interests or the Harbours health & well being at heart for the next 35 years. Why lease it out when we are getting things on track and providing the council with a great dividend each term??

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by



#4752



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	



**#4752**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Basic essential services eg rubbish bins, keep streets clean, heater and more reliable public transport. No bike lanes taking preced

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4764**



Stop overspending on roads, crossings and parks

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Wasteful spending and not essential

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Frequent buses etc, bus lanes to make service efficient

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

It could be used for more events if upgraded, such as concerts and festivals, not just sports

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Making money in other ways than increasing rates makes sense



**#4764**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Again, generating income from sources other than rates

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Keep up essential council services is important

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Better to use the land for general public benefit not private enterprise

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#4764



Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4764



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Waiheke

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
--	--------------



#4764



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Waiheke Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#4764



Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library.	Very Important
Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience.	Fairly Important
Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan.	Fairly Important
Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan.	Fairly Important
Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations.	Not Important
Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4781**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

There must be a way to make a facility like this work better for everyone, especially with the population growth north of the harbour bridge.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Need the money/councils dont need to be involved in airports/ ports.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#4781



Council doesnt need to run a port and should focus on other things.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#4781



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#4781



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important



#4781



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4784**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Auckland needs to invest in its public transport system and improve its cycle network.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport and cycling infrastructure and ensuring investment is targeted at facilitating growth in existing urban areas.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Opening growth in areas that are more expensive to build infrastructure, such as Drury or North West Auckland.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

Support what helps to make the most of the existing infrastructure and making it fit for purpose for the region.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

### Tell us why:

Support the sale of the AIAL shares, but suggest the money raised would be best used by investing in infrastructure now to achieve the council's objectives and mitigate the impacts of climate change.



**#4784**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Support retaining council ownership of port land and wharves, and leasing the operation of the port, but suggest the money from this could be invested in infrastructure/capital works now rather than in the fund

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Money from dividends should be used to invest in infrastructure now

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

The city should make better use of valuable space along the waterfront, especially for public use.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#4784



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

The city should make better use of valuable space along the waterfront, especially for public use.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#4784



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#4784



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

We don't need all these speed humps and raised crossings, what about those with mobility issues, using scooters etc. They need to be able to get around without obstacles.



**#4794**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We don't need crossings to be raised, they impede the flow of traffic and in my opinion add to congestion.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The ratepayers of Northshore paid for this stadium, it has easy access via the Northern Busway and should be better utilised than it is now

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

A future fund sounds good but I object to all of the airport shares being sold for it.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#4794**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The port (along with the airport) is a vital piece of infrastructure which must remain in local ownership. Bledisloe Wharf is vital for current port operations and needs to be retained. Future proposals I believe include developing a bigger berth for the larger cruise ships that call into Auckland. As a cruise turnaround port, we want the ships to continue calling here. It's not just tourists who cruise out of Auckland but us locals too. Cruise infrastructure needs to be upgraded.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#4794



**Tell us why:**

Port facilities need upgrading especially to accommodate the larger ships calling here including cruise.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4794



<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

<p>Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
---	-------------------------



#4794



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4873**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

NHS has suffered as a result of poor management (poor decision making) and poor promotion since it was taken over by TAU. Events will continue to be a major and growing part of life on the North Shore and NHS can continue to be the venue of choice for events in Auckland. Look at how other venues promote themselves, the efforts made to understand what event promoters want and how to engage with their communities.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#4873



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#4873



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#4873



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important



#4873



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

I support anything that promotes Devonport/Takapuna as a desirable location to live and work

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Disclose the list of employees quarterly

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Openly inform the public who are they paid for



**#4874**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Waste too much, leave it to private company

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

More fund to council the more waste. Leave it to private company

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



#4874



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Leave it to private companies

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Openly let public know who n what are we paying for

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#4874



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#4874



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important



#4874



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Yes. No new large costly projects, eg stadia, America's cup etc.



**#4933**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Ridiculous to encourage more cars and less pushbikes

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Yes, as per above

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

No more money and it is almost never full

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Poor economics

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#4933**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Actually I would prefer the port to be moved to Northland

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Repay debt

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Cost

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It's only just been built!



#4933



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#4933



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important



#4933



Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

"Aspects of" could be made to include anything.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Too far from the fundamentals

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Yes - please just focus on fundamental council activities including green spaces, infrastructure, and reducing debt



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

more on infrastructure until we get that to a level of comfort

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4954**



less on the frills such as community events, parks and playgrounds stuff (they are fab, but when push comes to shove, infra wins out in my view - it's been long underfunded). Perhaps public amenities could be dealt with on a risk basis (not sure how you allocate what is funded and when for playgrounds and parks... aka unless it's a danger to the kids and public; leave it for now)

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I don't use current public transport because it's too narrow - in and out of the city and not really connecting ACROSS the city. To me that would be money better spent, than enhancing existing channels. I do agree that while raised pedestrian crossings and bike lanes are a good idea, when money is tight, they are a luxury and not a necessity.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

roundabouts for problem intersections.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

the current status quo for the stadium clearly isn't working. Whether it should have a new operational management I'm unclear as to if it's current state is due to mismanagement or lack of financial funding/support. If it's the former then a new team is needed.



#4954



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I don't see how holding onto the Auckland shares provides financial benefit over and above diversifying (and therefore derisking) this investment.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Long term I believe the port needs to move. keeping ownership of the land will help this (I think!!) as private sale could mean the ruin of private investors that may not have the cities best interests at heart. leasing the operation would still help fund the Auckland future fund while the council considers what to do with this land when the lease terms are concluded... working with the port to move them away from this location during that tenure.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

council services can't afford to be stripped back further (tho I suspect there is a lot of waste in the system!)

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#4954



Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

this prime real estate has long been left to ferry terminals when much better use could be undertaken for the beautification of our city (bring in the tourist dollars) and for use by the public

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4954



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

We have got to protect our natural resources and environment - we have our kids to think about. No to rates funded rubbish... pay as you throw makes people think about



#4954



their waste. If funded, I see this negatively impacting this public behaviour. We can't charge our schools anything additional, they are under funded as it is and they would just pass this onto their parents in any event (as a single parent, I find the amount of expected donations for fund raising quite stressful).

## Local board priorities

### 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important



#4954



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

I'm not against ART but consider this a frill in times of economic hardship

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Just no more tower blocks being built without public consultation. Flies in the face of democracy and given the recent floods it's clear our infrastructure isn't coping. Why are we exasperating the issue. Very incensed on how this Takapuna tower block was pushed through. Bad call on bad process.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#4968



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Don't understand the logic behind stopping raised pedestrian crossings. Have several near where I live and they're much safer for my kids crossing to go to the shops. Fail to see the downside or lack of value and this doesn't appear to be articulated in the plan.

Likewise cycleways. We have an incredibly poor network. The local schools in my area are particularly underserved. Compare this to what is on offer as roading for cars. Why cut back on something you don't have yet but there is a need? Again the rationale is not clear in your proposal.

I note the proposal calls out "gold plated cycleways" would love to know where these are and try them out, they sound amazing! I cycle all over Auckland and I've never seen one. Again disappointed this is not covered in your proposal, not sure how you're expecting people to provide informed feedback here.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycleways. Safer walking and cycling options near schools (see Milford School, Takapuna Normal, Westlake Girls, Westlake Boys). Red light policing (not sure if this is in scope in any way).

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The ferry for bikes feasibility study. I use ferries for crossing the harbour with my bike as I live on the shore and work in the CBD. It's not a good system. Dedicated ferries is not the answer, don't bother.

Put differently imagine if we put a cap on the number of cars crossing the Harbour Bridge every hour and forced every car over the cap to take a ferry across the harbour. That's essentially what you're planning to do. Now add in cancellations, delays, queuing etc.

Doesn't make sense when you put it that way does it?

Open up a lane on the Bridge please. The feasibility study has been done. It's feasible, shovel ready, cheap to implement.



**#4968**



**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

If you're not going to use it then I can't see a reason for keeping it.

The downside to this is that Eden Park and Mt Smart are not great either.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Don't understand the implications

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Shift the port out of the CBD

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#4968



Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Keen to see the port move out of the CBD

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

Keen to see the port move out of the CBD

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#4968



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#4968



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important



#4968



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Not Important

**Tell us why**

Not so sure about new library. No issues with the current one.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Nothing

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Hire less council staff and improve your efficiency



**#4977**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

No need to make roads faster when the economy is slowing down.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More bike lanes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Less bus at off peak times

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Same cost but better and more facilities

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I believe investment can bring more income.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#4977



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

We need to generate more payments to lower the rates increase, as the living costs are already very high.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Currently council services brings lots of costs which need to be paid.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

I believe creating more public spaces at City waterfront is not necessary, as it does not bring a big difference in the already crowded areas.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#4977



**Tell us why:**

It would also lower the value of the proposed port lease by an estimated \$300 million or reduce the future profits and dividends the council earns from the port.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#4977



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#4977



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4998**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Good compromise

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Crossings, traffic "calming", speed limits

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Better use of the land.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

AIAL provides a steady stream of dividends.

Don't need overpaid investment managers taking their fees and adding no value.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#4998**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Same comments as for AIAL sales.

POAL provides a steady income. No need for overpaid investment managers.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

No need for AFF

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Worthwhile project.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#4998



**Tell us why:**

Cost too high. Public does not need this land.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#4998



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Plans to remove the pay as you throw service are plainly LUDICROUS.

As well as adding costs - it also goes completely counter our environmental and climate change aims.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#4998



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

A lot of this is should not be a high priority for the council. We live in straitened times.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Maintaining existing parks

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Cycling path on the Harbour bridge will be great

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#4999**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#4999



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	



#4999



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

will be great if you built a cycling path on the harbour bridge



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improved transport links to new communities (e.g. in northwest Auckland) which people have been encouraged to move to & now feel abandoned.

Improved handling of stormwater & wastewater, beyond currently planned projects (e.g. on the North Shore). I don't think the level of pollution entering the sea in Auckland is acceptable.



**#5020**



Maintaining public facilities (e.g. public bins & toilets) at their current level.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

"Urban regeneration" & densification, particularly in heritage areas such as Devon port, Ponsonby, Mt. Eden.

Specific Māori Outcomes funding. I think all Auckland ratepayers should be treated equally by the Council, and am not in favour of this earmarked funding.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I agree with improving public transport services (also ensuring these are competently run), and think more dynamic lanes are a good idea.

I think new communities on the outskirts of Auckland should also be included in this.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Improving the building traffic congestion (which is affecting both productivity & liveability) as quickly as possible.

Ensuring the standard & frequency of ferry services are improved, as these have been deteriorating.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Keep ongoing costs of the CRL as low as possible. This is a very expensive project & does not benefit all ratepayers equally (e.g. North Shore).

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**



#5020



North Harbour Stadium would be an ideal site for a genuine international stadium for Auckland & New Zealand (lots of land, parking options, motorway, busway & shopping centre nearby).

I believe the stadium should be kept, so this is still an option in future & it might be able to be redeveloped at that time, with larger grandstands, etc.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The Council's shareholding in both AIAL & Port of Auckland should be handled seriously, and in a way that delivers the most benefit for Aucklanders.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I previously worked at POAL, and this option probably makes most sense from both an internal & external perspective.

Moving the port in the next few years is not realistic or desirable, and having a commercial operator of the port on the current site, separate from the land ownership, would allow the port to operate like any other business, simplifying its dealings.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#5020



**Tell us here:**

This would likely bring greater benefits in the long-term & allow the Council's investment earnings to be managed together.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

These wharves currently serve minimal cargo compared to the rest of the port, and are closest to the Auckland CBD.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Bledisloe wharf is a major part of the port, and removing it within 15 years would seriously damage the effectiveness of Auckland's port (and potentially limit those interested in leasing the port land).

I am also not in favour of anything that would require additional cargo to be transported to Auckland by land within this time-frame.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Do not support



#5020



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#5020



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

I don't support the rates-funded refuse collection scheme, and would like this to stay as pay-as-you-throw.

This is an incentive to reduce household waste going to landfill.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna,Rodney

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#5020



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

I believe there are many more important issues in this local board area, including congestion (e.g. Lake Road), levels of crime, general public amenities (e.g. toilets & bins).

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

In general, I find the list of priorities outlined to be largely neither here nor there in terms of genuine impacts.

I also believe the money that is planned to be spent on a Takapuna library redevelopment could be better spent elsewhere, as I think this facility is still fit-for-purpose.

**Rodney Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?**



#5020



I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Fairly Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	Fairly Important
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	Very Important
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	Fairly Important
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Fairly Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Fairly Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	I don't know
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	I don't know

**Tell us why**



**#5020**



It would be nice to have some more things for the Kumeu-Huapai area in there (e.g. investigating a new or larger dog park in Huapai Domain).

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Most of the things in the list sound like suitable priorities.

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Kumeu

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5032**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#5032



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#5032



Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of	Support



#5032



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Very Important



#5032



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

What is the Destination management plan exactly? I am not in favour of the proposal for the new library in Takapuna as I think the existing library is wonderful, with the underground car park below.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I am not in favour of the proposal for the new library in Takapuna as I think the existing library is wonderful, with the underground car park below.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More for public transport

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5104**



Less free car parking

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We should continue with active transport initiatives, including pedestrian crossing and cycleways.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Enforcing parking infringements

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

The stadium is underutilised, and there is no evidence of future demand.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#5104**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Given New Zealand's history of underinvestment in critical transport infrastructure, moving the port to Firth of Thames or Whangarei is not practicable. Even if an alternate port existed with rail and road connected to Auckland, the additional supply chain costs (fuel, handling ...) aren't attractive. They'd be an additional cost of living expense. The port must remain on the Waitematā, regardless of operator or landownership. Only a fool or land developer with vested interests would disagree.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Rates and fee should cover council services. Profits and dividends used for investment

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

If Captain Cook and Marsden wharves are transferred to council, we must ensure it is for public benefit; the example of the Hilton Hotel restricting public access to Princes Wharf is not repeated. The transfer to council must only go ahead if it for the b



#5104



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Given New Zealand’s history of underinvestment in critical transport infrastructure, moving the port to Firth of Thames or Whangarei is not practicable. Even if an alternate port existed with rail and road connected to Auckland, the additional supply chain costs (fuel, handling ...) aren’t attractive. They’d be an additional cost of living expense. The port must remain on the Waitematā, regardless of operator or landownership. Only a fool or land developer with vested interests would disagree.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Do not support



#5104



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?



#5104



I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5121**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#5121



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5121



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



**#5121**



## Local board priorities

### 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### 8. Do you have any other comments?

I support the increased \$35m of investment into the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund

I support increased investment for the Sport and Recreation Operating Grant

c. We support a review of the cost of and how maintenance is delivered for sports fields

I support increasing the level of Development Contributions collected and using them for community sport and recreation facilities



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Transport: much more public transport, safe cycle lanes, pedestrian connections to and from supermarkets and shopping centers

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5142**



Transport: Less on roads

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport, cycle lanes, pedestrian connection!

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Roads for cars and trucks

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Under used

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#5142**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Professional investment managers will guide the asset's development better than the current managers do.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#5142



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#5142



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#5142



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

New stadium

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5147**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#5147



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#5147



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#5147**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Listen and include more ideas from Bernard Hickett et al.

<https://thekaka.substack.com/p/a-challenge-to-wayne-browns-debt>

More evidence based decisions across the board. e.g the current justification for raised pedestrian crossings (saving lives and serious injuries) is based on national



#5161



stats that have been miscommunicated - The maths looks incorrect and the comparison deeply flawed. How many were actually in Auckland, and how many were actually injured or killed on old style pedestrian crossings, given the justification is required to upgrade to raised ones?

<https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/ldr/511266/cheaper-raised-pedestrian-crossings-for-auckland>)

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

There appears to be a lot of smaller decisions that are nice to have not necessary; e.g. Replacing/rebuilding perfectly adequate childrens playgrounds / removing free left turns at road intersections (e.g. Takapuna central) / building ridiculous streetscapes with huge ugly planters and random shelters e.g. Huron and Northcroft streets Takapuna.

Closing lanes/roads, including major traffic management requirements (costs)for minor works (e.g for almost any suburban street housing project).

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Our transport is pretty \*\*\*\*\* now. How can we grow without addressing it now, and into the the future. Actually I personally don't want the growth forecast.

BTW Bikes are valid transport!

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport subsidies to encourage use.

Rail.

Another harbour crossing. (Toll the bridge again to help raise new crossing funds).

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**



#5161



Raised pedestrian crossings, not because of hosing (sic), not because of cost, there is just poor justification/business case.

More evidence based decisions across the board. e.g the current justification for raised pedestrian crossings (saving lives and serious injuries) is based on national stats that have been miscommunicated - The maths looks incorrect and the comparisson deeply flawed. How many were actually in Auckland, and how many were actually injured or killed on old style pedestrian crossings, given the justification is required to upgrade to raised ones?

<https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/ldr/511266/cheaper-raised-pedestrian-crossings-for-auckland>)

### 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

#### Tell us why:

It's a great facility under utilised and poorly managed. I have been involved with business events there and the stadium management is hopeless. No ownership or incentive to be top notch, innovative, provide services. Get the council out of it. Lease it.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

#### Tell us why:

I would like the advice of independent economists i.e Bernard Hickey.

This is a perfectly reasoned and justified commentary that needs accomodating

<https://thekaka.substack.com/p/a-challenge-to-wayne-browns-debt>

### 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



**#5161**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Certainly keep ownership of the land and lease it to whoever forever.

But I don't see an option to get the port out of Auckland altogether, along with the trucks associated with it.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Not enough critique and options have been socialised

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

I don't see an option to get the port out of Auckland altogether, along with the trucks associated with it.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#5161



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

If we are going to downsize, or get rid of the port (my preferred option) we need to start limiting it's capacity somehow.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	



#5161



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#5161



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	I don't know
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

I support local boards and they should not be downsized. Our citizen representation in Auckland was already one of the lowest per capita of like cities/countries.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I think they have done generally a good job. As always I believe the devil is in the detail as with the rest of council decisions. Pragmatism, evidence and value (monetary or social) need to be amongst the principles of decision making.



**#5161**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do less
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

What was the purpose of the super city council established on November 1, 2010? A merger of the Auckland, North Shore, Waitakere, and Manukau City Councils, the Rodney, Papakura, and Franklin District Councils, and the Auckland Regional Council. One of the purposes is to spend less so as to increase revenue.



**#5162**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Do the project right the first time to prevent wasting money.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We are the only developed country that does not have a train to Auckland Airport.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Decongest traffic at Esmonde Road, Takapuna, to Devonport by constructing a connection from Fred Thomas Drive, Takapuna, to Francis Street, Bayswater.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

duplicate events, such as the Christmas parade in almost all the suburbs. Make it a unique one.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It must be proactive in leasing out the venues at an affordable price to kick-start attracting customers.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#5162**



**Tell us why:**

The business climate is back to normal. Let the dividends pay for the expenses.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Make the most of it by being the operator.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

The council needs the money during economic hardships.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Operate the council like a corporate business. The aim is to make profits and cut losses.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#5162



**Tell us why:**

To increase revenues.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Keep two-thirds of it as an operational area and transfer one-third to the council to provide public benefit.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	<p>Other</p>



#5162



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**



#5162



I do not support any priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

not the right time to implement due to a lack of funding.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It is taking away the focus on financial problems.



**#5162**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

It is about time to introduce toll gate fees on the Harbour Bridge to pay for the maintenance and services.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5190**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#5190



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#5190



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#5190



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	



**#5190**



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5200**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#5200



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5200



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



**#5200**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5243**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Better use could be made of the facilities.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#5243



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	I don't know



#5243



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5243



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Pay as you go is a better option if you want residents to throw out less and recycle more. The rest of the city should be changing to pay as you go for just this reason,

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Not Important



#5243



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

We should be saving money.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Food scraps initiative is horrendous for Auckland residents that have to do it. It makes money for the government because they tax us and then they sell the scraps. Meanwhile it would be better if we used our compost bins.

Also, our trash should be on a pay as you go system. This way you are not encouraging people to just throw everything out in the general trash because they have already paid for it...



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5263**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Make public transport more reliable - doesn't need to be faster or more frequent

Reduce temporary traffic management

Introduce Dynamic lanes

Stop raised pedestrian crossings

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Use proceeds from surplus land to assist modify stadium stands to accommodate smaller crowds

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#5263**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Any lease arrangement that locks in Port operations at current site is undesirable. All planning should be with a view to enabling and accelerating relocation of (some of) the Port

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#5263



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#5263



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#5263



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

increase the support of the house rent fees, and the comunity card service card benefits as this is the direct benefit that people find easily to access

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5361**



Do less of tax in order to do less of community developments such as holding a event or roads fixing which people doesn't really get much benefits and doesn't feel that they are getting much help from the government support.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

i suport this:

making public transport faster, more reliable and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay and introducing capped weekly public transport passes

stopping some previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

yes allowing phones to be used instead of hop cards, or on top of the use of the hop cards, and making the bus fees cheapers, like sale

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

I would for this; network optimisation, reducing temporary traffic management requirements and introducing dynamic lanes

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**



**#5361**



As a hockey player that uses this hockey stadium it would be useful to have redeveloped hockey stadium but I would like them to offer much more various and broad sports coachings as well as games (since it's redeveloping)

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Not really direct help towards citizens

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#5361



I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5361



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?



#5361



I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

the fund fee that goes to schools in this area, education. and more importantly to support those who rents houses in this area to support them with paying the rental houses fees every week which makes big financial struggles.



**#5361**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Pointless vanity projects that green bin thing and keeping names as is



**#5367**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think we need more busses and trains

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Trains and busses

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Extra lanes

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#5367**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#5367



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#5367



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Railways and public transport routes.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#5392**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I support more public transport.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Trains and busses

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

I support more use of this stadium.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#5392



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in	Support
---	---------



#5392



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5392



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Very Important



#5392



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5401**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public Transport and Cycleways. making walkable cities

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

more roads

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#5401



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#5401



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#5401



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Albert-Eden,Devonport-Takapuna,Franklin,Waiheke

### Albert-Eden Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Albert-Eden in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Celebrating different people and cultures, bringing people together with fun and engaging activities, and reducing barriers for those who might struggle to connect with council or others in the community.	Fairly Important
Continuing our environmental work through tree planting, parks restoration, supporting volunteer pest control and planting groups and helping community climate action through our Climate Activator.	Very Important
Planning for how our parks and open space can respond to growth, making the most of what we have, balancing different uses and connecting green spaces together.	Fairly Important



#5401



Supporting our community groups with funding, information, learning new skills and building their capability and networks.	Not Important
Settling in at the new, medium-term location for the Pt Chevalier library and continuing to investigate what the long-term library solution might be and how we will fund it.	Fairly Important
Working with the community on activations in the Mt Albert Civic Square.	Fairly Important
Making our parks rubbish-bin free to minimise waste and improve environmental and climate outcomes.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Albert-Eden proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important



#5401



Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Franklin Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I don't know

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, 'Belmont' Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	Very Important
--	----------------



#5401



Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that are willing to and capable of delivering social, environmental, cultural and economic outcomes in line with the local board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	Fairly Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Very Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Very Important
Find ways to reduce Franklin’s maintenance costs e.g. by replacing lawn with eco-sourced native trees and reducing or relocating public rubbish bins.	Very Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Fairly Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Fairly Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



#5401



Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Not from the Franklin area

## Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library.	Not Important
Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience.	Very Important
Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan.	Very Important
Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan.	Fairly Important
Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations.	Very Important



**#5401**



Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Environment and regulation as well as Transport is what I believe should be payed more for.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5405**



Perhaps parks and community infrastructure should be spent less money on but should be sustained every certain period of time e.g 5-10 years depending on the safety regulation report.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

I believe that this proposal is reasonable and well put, I support this proposal fully.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Perhaps network optimisation.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Making transport faster, transport seems to be quite efficient currently.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

The consideration of redeveloping the stadium would seem appropriate.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

### **Tell us why:**



**#5405**



This is a fund that could gain additional income for a region in New Zealand which could be beneficial.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I don't know.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I don't know.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No I do not.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't know.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know



#5405



Tell us why:

I don't know.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#5405



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No I do not.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

No I do not.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5410**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

More efficient use of resources

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#5410



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	I don't know



#5410



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5410



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Albert-Eden,Devonport-Takapuna

## Albert-Eden Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Albert-Eden in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Celebrating different people and cultures, bringing people together with fun and engaging activities, and reducing barriers for those who might struggle to connect with council or others in the community.	Very Important
Continuing our environmental work through tree planting, parks restoration, supporting volunteer pest control and planting groups and helping community climate action through our Climate Activator.	Very Important
Planning for how our parks and open space can respond to growth, making the most of what we have, balancing different uses and connecting green spaces together.	Fairly Important
Supporting our community groups with funding, information, learning new skills and building their capability and networks.	Fairly Important
Settling in at the new, medium-term location for the Pt Chevalier library and continuing to	Fairly Important



#5410



investigate what the long-term library solution might be and how we will fund it.	
Working with the community on activations in the Mt Albert Civic Square.	Not Important
Making our parks rubbish-bin free to minimise waste and improve environmental and climate outcomes.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Albert-Eden proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	I don't know
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	I don't know
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	I don't know



#5410



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	I don't know
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Too confusing



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Better more efficient public transport

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#5414



Environmental costs

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I agree with the expansions with the hope transport becomes more reliable and efficient

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More reliable transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Airport shuttles

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

I don't think that is an top priority

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Because I see benefits and draw backs from both situations



**#5414**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Because the ports are really important to nz especially in Auckland

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Because it will fund more important projects

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Ports are important to nz and I understand needing income however taking out a vital part of nz.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#5414



**Tell us why:**

Because I use the ferry a lot and we need extra wharfs for the demand of water travel

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#5414



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#5414



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Because Devonport is a very touristic town that needs tourists plus the above also just reflect my personal views and what's a priority for me

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Their ok but there's room for improvement

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Don't put more social housing In Devonport



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5432**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I support this proposal because I'm a big advocate for the improvement of Auckland's public transport. Public transport is important to the majority of the city's population and thus I believe it's important.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

I think for how underused the stadium is, 33 million dollars is too much to go into it, and it would be better if it was reallocated.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think that we need to put more money into other places and that shares in the port and airport are relevant at this point in time (when compared to other things like public transport or waterways that are in dire need of funding)

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#5432**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

As previously mentioned, shares in the port aren't relevant right now and the money would be better-off used elsewhere.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

In my answer above.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

I think it would be in the public's best interest.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#5432



Tell us why:

Auckland’s port is still key to our economy so it’s important to keep some of it,

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5432



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
--	--------------



#5432



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

I think the library and community centres are more relevant to the community as opposed to parks who are only relevant to a certain group of people.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Please prioritise public transport.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5447**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other



#5447



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5447



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#5447**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Local taxes



**#5448**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#5448



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Do not support



#5448



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	I don't know
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Do not support



#5448



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	



#5448



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

fussy flower gardens and sculptures



**#5462**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

the cost it way too high as is

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#5462



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5462



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#5462



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important



#5462



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Not Important

**Tell us why**

Takapuna library is absolutely lovely, has parking, we do not need a new one!

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

A flat waste of our money

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop messing up our main Streets at great expense - Hurstmere Rd, Huron St & nearby streets, Queen St



**#5523**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The current management entity has to go,

In addition I am forced to go for option 1, to avoid "deconstruction" and selling of land. but it seems to need some reconfiguration out of the maintenance budget.

DO NOT SELL LAND to fund ongoing expenses

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

DO NOT SELL Council land or assets (including but not limited to Ports of Auckland & Airport shares) to fund ongoing expenses.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#5523**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Definitely retain ownership of the land, re ability to plan & control future development. Uncertain about the lease, probably a good idea re any new development i.e stadium proposed is currently pie-in-the-sky with no funding & none likely for years, & years. (& current proposals very unsuitable & shortsighted).

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Just at the moment this is top priority, may change

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

any change --&gt;NEW PUBLIC SPACES ONLY

Do not sell council = citizen land

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



#5523



any change --&gt;NEW PUBLIC SPACES ONLY

Do not sell council = citizen land

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support



#5523



<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5548**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#5548



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#5548



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support



#5548



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important



#5548



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

There is no mention of anything to do with growing, supporting and maintaining a resilient food system in Auckland. With the impact climate change (and other events such as COVID) are having on our food system, buying a nourishing diet is becoming unaffordable. Yet, good nutrition is key for a thriving population. I would like to see the council put money towards supporting local growers and initiatives that align with a



**#5592**



resilient, sustainable, healthy kai system. For instance, supporting Kelmarna farms, KiwiHarvest, and Love Food Hate Waste. For more advice on how this could be achieved, I recommend consulting with Eat NZ.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The council should support the community to run the stadium as is best for the needs of the community; it is the community who are most in touch with how it would benefit them and should be empowered to make these decisions, whilst the council can support them in achieving these needs.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



#5592



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#5592



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	I don't know
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	I don't know
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know



#5592



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5604**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Support redeveloping the stadium precinct as long as surplus funds are reinvested back into the North Shore community, for example, the multi-sport development at Albany Tennis Park.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#5604



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#5604



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5604



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Upper Harbour

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Fairly Important



#5604



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I would like the Local Board to increase investment into sport and recreation to provide more opportunities for participation.

I do not support an increase in charges for community leases as this will lead to additional costs and have negative effects on participation

**Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local	



#5604



services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I support most priorities

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

Fairly Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Fairly Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Not Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped	Fairly Important



#5604



reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	

**Tell us why**

I would like the Local Board to increase investment into sport and recreation to provide more opportunities for participation

I do not support an increase in charges for community leases as this will lead to additional costs and have negative effects on p

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3	Not Important



#5604



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I would like the Local Board to increase investment into sport and recreation to provide more opportunities for participation

I do not support an increase in charges for community leases as this will lead to additional costs and have negative effects on participation

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**



**#5604**



**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I support the increased \$35m of investment into the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund.

I support increasing the level of Development Contributions collected and using them for community sport and recreation facilities.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5619**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

cheap fees in council owned carparks subsidizes driving

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#5619



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#5619



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5619



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Kaipātiki

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Fairly Important



#5619



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

cycle infrastructure

**Howick Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	
Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses.	



#5619



Develop a community-led climate action plan.	
Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I support most priorities

**Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Kaipātiki in 2024/2025?**

Fairly Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#5619



facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs.	
Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community	Fairly Important
Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control.	Not Important
Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation.	Fairly Important
Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan.	Fairly Important
Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture.	

**Tell us why**

flood protection wairau valley and stream

**7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Please more cycling investment, more public transport, more action on climate change.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5623**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Oppose cuts to cycling and safety

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycling and public transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Road sealing where barely anyone lives

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Please change the stadium, I live on the shore yet I've been there five times in my life and barely anyone was there. Yet go to Eden park and mt smart all the time. Change it and aim it at the promoters who will actually use it

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The shares barely make any money put it to an investment that makes a better return.



**#5623**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Don't lease the port. Will be a huge mistake for the city. Please think long term

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Where's the mention of climate change? Have you forgotten it's your biggest issue and the biggest issue our city faces

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#5623



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5623



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Don't change the CATTR, it was promised to be value add not a slush fund for business as usual.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#5623



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Put the library in the new square. The current library is old and is in the wrong place. Think about the future not just the current grumpy people

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

The seem fine. More focus on environmental issues please. We only get one chance.



**#5623**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

To future proof Auckland in the context of a growing population(from climate change, flooding and provide equitable transport options and drinking water, protect the sea from wastewater overflows) I think we have an obligation to do as much as we can. Unfortunately this does also mean unpalatable rates increases. But the alternative



#5646



means we pay in other ways with unclean water, more flooding, no improvements to our urban environment etc.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

The main thing I can see as being unpalatable for Aucklanders will be a do more scenario of paying a 14% increase in 2025. If this was kept to 10% I think it would seem a lot more reasonable to more Aucklanders. The presentation of that large gap between the central proposal and the do more, means that I can't see many Aucklanders voting for do more. Just because of the 14% increase. In the same vein, in the central proposal, why don't we have a more similar rates increase in the middle year, so we know what's expected and can continue on at pace with any investments made in year 1. Do as much as we can to help improve Auckland and make it as liveable a city for everyone as we can. Whilst I don't look forward to rates increases, I think because of aging infrastructure we are duty bound to invest as much as we can in the future.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I don't believe that we should be stopping raised crossings. We have been lucky enough to have a couple of raised crossings go into our area in the last few years. For my piece of mind with two young sons making their own way around the area they are fantastic. A couple of years back my son and husband were working the school crossing (this was just a painted crossing not raised) and they were on one side with the metal bar that shows cars to wait whilst kids cross to school. As my son was walking out the metal bar, a car came whooshing past the crossing (didn't see them - I don't know how) and was travelling so fast it nearly took out the kids. A raised crossing slows down speeds and makes cars reduce their speed and I believe would have helped in this situation. Thankfully this crossing has been upgraded to be a raised one. But I do feel lucky and I would hope that other kids and schools get that same opportunity for increased safety and peace of mind.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**



#5646



Not reduce the spend on raised crossings. I personally would also fast track cycleways to enable other options for people to travel. To provide children with an opportunity to cycle to school safely is amazing for a child's confidence and development. Perhaps there are ways to increase our cycleways without always having a fully engineered outcome (although often these do provide nice safe routes for kids and people of all ages so I'm not against them).

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

I'm not 100% on this one, but I feel that once we've lost a public facility and space like this it is hard to build it back in to an urban infrastructure. I think that everything possible should be done to get a working model first before selling and changing direction. I don't believe this has been done. But I do think that increasing the Albany pool on this site would be a good idea. When this was conceived the plans were watered down and it's always at capacity, doesn't have a pool option for adults to swim alongside. I think this would be an excellent facility for the area (and needed) but it's not quite good enough at the moment. But there is plenty of space there at the moment for the footprint to be extended.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other



**#5646**



**Tell us here:**

I'm not against leasing the port but is 35 years the right length of time. That means that other future plans for the area cannot happen earlier than 35 years, which seems an awfully long time away.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#5646



Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#5646



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#5646



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Badminton North Harbour

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5675**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#5675



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#5675



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#5675



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important



#5675



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Expansion of Aucklands public transport + fare reduction. More bus rapid transit, more electrified rail network with new stations, more dedicated buslanes for non rapid transit bus lines. Get the city moving faster and cheaper please. Also make the cbd worldclass. Remove kainga ora accomodation in the cbd and get homeless people off inner city streets please. Some more pedestrian/PT only streets would be nice too.



#5683



Make the parks safer. Maybe add an enclosed escalator public transport system in the city from Ponsonby to Parnell, that goes up and down all the hills in between like Victoria Street and Albert Park. Kind of like in Chongqing, China.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Back office staff. Less funding for community/cultural events and services. We need infrastructure like better transport networks and water management systems yesterday, so all this non-essential stuff can wait.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Focusing on Public Transport capacity, speed and fare price is good. I would prefer more dedicated buslanes though instead of dynamic lanes. Too many people park/drive in them when they aren't supposed to, reducing their effectiveness. Also Auckland's buses that are not rapid transit are quite slow in my experience compared to say Wellington, especially in the CBD area. They really need their own full-time lanes. With enough PT improvements, cycling and walking cuts are offset.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

A new Northwest to Albany bus rapid transit and a Botany to Manukau bus rapid transit via East Tamaki.

Improvements to existing Northwest bus rapid transit. It's not exactly express in its current form. More suburban residential stops on bus rapid transit. The Northern Busway has Sunnynook stop but besides that it's all business parks/commercial areas, maybe a Tristram Road stop and/or Pinehill. Would be a good addition.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

New road projects. Maybe fix some of the more dangerous or bizarre intersections in the city, but mostly try to keep new roads to a minimum. Just repurpose existing infrastructure to prioritize PT, like more dedicated buslanes ;)



#5683



### 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

#### Tell us why:

I dont use it. I dont see many people using it. Seems like an unnecessary use of funds so we could probably afford to lose most of it. That albany shopping area would be improved by some more apartment blocks, townhouses around it. Or perhaps use some of the land for a new north to northwest bus rapid transit route ;)

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

#### Tell us why:

Creating a city managed fund sounds good, but personally i like the idea of the city retaining a stake in critical infrastructure like airports. Surely this operation is profitable in some way considering it is the biggest in the country? Would be a shame budget/control wise to sell lucrative infrastructure shares for all time and have others profit while the city watches. Couldnt we just do the lease thing again here or do we not own enough anymore? Maybe sell the zoo or non essential things like that.

### 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

#### Tell us here:

Leasing sounds ok as it is an impermanent change. Maybe just do 20 year leases though. 35 seems kindof excessive. What if the new operator sucks? What if the deal is no longer a good one 10 or 20 years in? Would be a shame to be stuck with it for 3+ decades.



#5683



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

A managed fund for the city is welcome. Solid long term idea right here.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

They are right in front of britomart, surely theres a better use for this prime land.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It wouldnt be returned any time soon + if we are leasing the port we dont want the value reduced too much. Maybe after a 20-30 year lease expires could do something then.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#5683



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support



#5683



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support any priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Not Important



#5683



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

This all sounds like a waste of my money. We dont need a new library. All the events and art partners sounds like business/corporate welfare. No co-governance with iwi. Transport and water infrastructure improments are more important than all of this.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Focus on transport and water infrastructure please. Everything else can wait.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Much more ambitious public transport improvement.

Accelerate the improvements to waste/stormwater separation to keep our beaches swimmable.



**#5685**



I would also like to see Auckland Council take a proactive approach to managing risks to property by climate change and natural disaster. Rather than waiting until a property has been ruined and buying it out, identify and place notices of requirement on homes (especially coastal homes) which will be at increasing risk in future.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Auckland Council should consider areas where the Mayor's Office duplicates functions already provided by Auckland Council - for instance paying for the mayor to use legal and PR consultants - and reduce the Mayor's Office budget accordingly.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Transport is the biggest contributor to Auckland's emissions, and the biggest drag on quality of life. Improvements have to be made to allow the city to be more productive. So replacing the lost revenue from the RFT makes sense.

However, scrapping projects like cycleways, which aim to increase the attractiveness, and safety of non-car travel is short sighted, and doesn't achieve a meaningful budget change, so it looks tokenistic. Auckland Council should continue to recognise that taking cars off the road by providing good alternatives through reliable and cost-effective public transport, cycling and walking, is a far more sensible investment than building ever more, much more expensive roads.

The proposed costs savings in bus service reductions and price hikes for 'premium' ferry services will have the perverse effect of encouraging or requiring more reliance on cars, reinforcing the myth that Aucklanders don't want to use PT. Survey after survey shows Aucklanders' biggest priority for PT is to make it cheaper and more reliable, so they can depend on it. When AT put on free services for a day a few years ago the system nearly collapsed due to surge in demand. PT use will reduce congestion and make it easier for road users on the existing network without expensive upgrades, and should be the single focus of LTP investment in transport.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**



**#5685**



Some public transport options (for instance, ferries from the Devonport Peninsular) still operate at reduced levels relative to 2019, but cost ever more to use. The LTP should aim to increase service frequency and choice across the network, and decrease fares, so that public transport's attractiveness improves relative to driving.

Before charging for Park and Ride spaces, the LTP should provide for much more local connections to the relevant stations - otherwise, the economics of paying for parking AND bus fare begin to make driving more attractive, reducing the incentive to use PT.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Not sure dynamic lanes are worth the cost - maybe just use Time of Use Charging or create time-limited bus lanes.

### **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

#### **Tell us why:**

The stadium is not valued in its present configuration, as demonstrated by regular users such as North Harbour rugby and NZ football choosing to use other grounds for matches.

In future, there may be a good business case for (for instance) conversion to an international cricket oval, so option 2 retains the core use of the site for community sports but leaves future options available if they stack up.

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

#### **Tell us why:**

Auckland Council desperately needs alternative longterm revenue options besides rates. This option is preferable to the 23/24 budget proposal in that it seeks a long-term revenue stream rather than a short term sugar rush from selling assets.



**#5685**



The choice of fund manager should be made with a close eye on reducing administrative costs so maximum value returns to the city.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

It's not clear how a lease operator would be able to make the port more profitable than PoAL has been able to be. This raises the risk of a private operator seeking to extract costs from Council downstream (such as for 'unforeseen' capital investment) which obliterates the lease income.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

with the reduction in available port operations space, this increases the likelihood of a private port operator running into financial difficulties and extracting funds from the Council by way of unplanned investment or a bail out.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#5685



This area could be used for dedicated cruise ship services, creating an improved visitor experience, and reducing the impact these vessels currently have on ferry services.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support



#5685



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#5685



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

creating events and supporting community organisations is significant to building and maintaining a sense of community, combating isolation and loneliness experienced by the elderly and minority communities and building connections which help with resilience in times of trouble (eg: pandemic, floods).

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5728**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Totally agree with stopping cycleways, which are not at all well used. Absolutely stop raised pedestrian crossings. Traffic management is completely over the top and road cone usage out of control.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Road cones shutting down traffic lanes unnecessarily and cycleways.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#5728



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#5728



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5728



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Fairly Important



#5728



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Too much emphasis on ethnicity and Iwi consultation - we are one.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Re Parks.

Sell Eden Park.

Develop Western Springs as International Cricket Ground

Develop a dedicated Waterfront, Rugby, League, Soccer and Concert Stadium



**#5764**



Keep North Harbour and Mt Smart Stadiums for overflow of above activities, training bases and local fixtures.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Get the harbor tunnel underway.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

See my comments 1c.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The Port is making money now. Keep the asset.



**#5764**



Ditto shares in the Airport.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Develop Captain Cook and Masden Wharfs into Waterfront Stadium. See 1c.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



#5764



Do it now, see 1c

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#5764



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide	Very Important



#5764



decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5784**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#5784



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Do not support



#5784



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5784



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	I don't know
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important



#5784



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#5792**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We desperately need to improve public transport. If the government are taking away the petrol tax, then they need to pay for any roading. Developers need to contribute towards required infrastructure based on increased population due to their development.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Its an asset that needs more use - if possible - concerts etc.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



**#5792**



**Tell us here:**

Its not the councils business to run a port.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

We need to be prepared for future issues.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Self insurance is a real possibility for many of us, including the Council.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

We have the Viaduct and Wynard Quarter for now. To reduce traffic from Port of Tauranga best, to leave as is for now. The council doesnt appear to have clear plans for use of the land and Im not sure how it would make more money from this property, more

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#5792



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#5792



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#5792



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I dont understand why the community services budget is \$12m and environmental services is only \$86k over the same time period. Governance at \$900k is also hugely questionable in comparison to the environmental services budget.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#5805



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think investing in cycling infrastructure is important

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycling, making public transport viable and accessible

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

I live on the north shore and I don't even know where the stadium is

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Years of underinvestment have already caught up with us. Of course it's important that funds are spent appropriately and responsibly, and that i itself is hard to agree on, but moving away from the ambulance-at-the-bottom-of-the-cliff model hasn't served us w

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



#5805



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#5805



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	



#5805



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Fairly Important



#5805



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

These are the things that make this big, sprawling city enjoyable to live in. Without them, Auckland is an unappealing place to live or visit

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

A relentless focus on long term infrastructure (of all varieties) that eases congestion on all modes of transport, keeps Auckland moving, sorts out stadia inertia and enhances the liveability of the city/CBD.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5875**



Less near term subsidies, traffic management plans, hand outs and virtue signalling for one hit wonders such as silly signs, "safety improvements", pet projects and one off cultural events.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

### **Tell us why:**

Bring in user pays (congestion charging, tolls, fuel tax, I don't care what) and recycle all funds raised in back into the network to support all modes of transport. The priority should be improving travel times and easing congestion, not safety improvements and virtue signalling.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Infrastructure that will last 10-50yrs, not the next 5yrs. No band-aid projects.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Silly speed bumps, pretty signs, traffic management plans every time someone wants to fart near a road.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

It's white elephant in an backward part of town. I live on the Shore but I hate going there.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#5875**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Need long term planning and assets to be ring-fenced to leverage off to fund more assets. It's a great model that works in AU states. If done well and councillors are smart enough to avoid dipping into it for operational expenses and pet projects it could be a really good thing.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The waterfront land must be retained and public access must be improved. Any operational decisions that are consistent with that are worth considering.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The port should be leveraged off to fund long term assets, not used to offset operational expenses.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#5875



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5875



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna



#5875



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

Tell us why

Too much virtue signalling.



**#5875**



**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Infrastructure and ensuring rates paid by the area get spent on the area on things like Lake Road.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

cycle ways.

making the high density urban areas more pedestrian and cycle friendly -KEEP raised pedestrian crossings and add more.



**#5892**



Increase in bus lanes and incentivise bus use  
environmental protection

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

You cannot have lower cost safe cycleways - do it once and do it well. Need safest possible cyclelanes so that tamariki and older people will use cycling as a means of transport.

Need more raised pedestrian crossings - cars are lethal weapons and no amount of cajoling seems to improve driving. We need safe pedestrian accessways.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

cycleways

safety measures for pedestrians

bus services

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Its a lemon



**#5892**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Not against the fund but don't want shares sold.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#5892



So long as it is not used for private apartments!! It needs to be kept for all the people of Auckland just look at that hideous Hilton building on prime land. We need to have a waterfront that we can be proud of rather than apologetic.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#5892



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Please do not pay rubbish collection from general rates - we will never reduce recycle etc if people aren't aware of the cost of their rubbish disposal.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna



#5892



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

#### Tell us why

Do not move the takapuna library - the new plan will not be fit for purpose. It will be too difficult for prams, elderly and disabled people to access with no parking onsite. The



**#5892**



new plan is for a much smaller building not sure why when the area is growing.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Get nervous when there is no specific detail about what is planned for our parks and reserves. How do we stop developers cutting down trees?

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Pumptracks, learn to ride tracks, bike skills courses, trails, and other recreational cycling facilities where people can safely grow their confidence on a bike

Eke Panuku’s redevelopment of town centres, which often includes making safe walking and cycling connections, as well as improving access for disabled people.



**#5908**



Improvements aligned with the Central Rail Link like the Karanga-a-hape station improvements project, which includes a protected cycleway along part of Pitt street, a pedestrian mall in Mercury Lane, and could include improvements for Canada Street

The Making Space for Water programme's inclusion of "blue-green corridors". These are walking and cycling paths through greenspaces and alongside streams, adding to our walking, cycling network while also creating a natural drainage area.

Auckland Climate Grants and the Live Lightly Programme which can fund community-led programmes to empower people to ride bikes for transport

More investment for local boards: enabling them to better deliver on local climate action plans and local transport priorities

Supporting moves to a circular economy and zero waste, ensuring waste materials are seen as resources to be reused, repaired, repurposed and recycled, and are diverted from landfill.

Lowering emissions by becoming a leader in localised renewable energy generation by enabling local integrated energy solutions to support community owned energy groups.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Wanting increased investment in cycling infrastructure and maintenance. Investing in cycling has benefit-cost ratios of anywhere from 10:1 up to 25:1

Support for multi-modal trips: such as the proposed \$50 weekly cap for public transport, bikes on buses, more investment in train services, and whether or not you support light rail

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

I want Auckland Council to spend more on safe, accessible, and attractive active transport infrastructure such as cycleways, walkways, and public transport.



**#5908**



**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

want Auckland Council to spend less on new roading projects that prioritise private vehicles as the primary transport mode.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Use the waterfront for housing, commercial and recreational spaces.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**



#5908



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

The location of the wharves are ideal for housing, commercial and recreational uses. It's a waste of land to keep them as ports.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Other</p>



#5908



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#5908



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important



#5908



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

priorities should include the growth of active transport networks such as cycleways and walkways, establishment and development of green corridors, Development and implementation of Climate Action Plans and Circular economy strategies and actions.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5909**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Keep the progress on cycleways and raised pedestrian crossings - these make urban centres more successful, and better places to be - "strip shopping" regenerates when the environment is more pleasant. More people will walk and ride local trips, reducing congestion when they feel safer ( slower car speeds, wider footpaths and cycle lanes). Invest into more bus lanes from city to airport on motorway. Keep subsidising public transport, and charge a congestion fee for inner city or electronic toll on major congested routes to pay for it.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

There are other stadiums in the region that cater for most needs. It makes no sense investing funds into a complex that wont provide an economic return.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#5909**



The airport is an important asset to the community, and the council should retain some control over its future direction and success. If shares were to be sold down, a "kiwishare" concept should be in place to ensure that the airport company has an obligation to provide agreed transport, tourism and other outcomes to the Auckland and NZ public.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Auckland needs a port to be efficient. Just run it better. Low utilized land could be leased for redevelopment

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

No point having a future fund and paying interest on debt. Use dividends to pay down debt or service interest etc

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#5909



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Keep Bledisloe for Port, provided, when it is costed out, it is used by the port in a profitable manner ( ie: income &gt; land lease cost) - if its just used as a lazy space for cars, with little or no financial return, then re use the space for non port, and require cars to be removed from port within 6 hours to a new holding site away from the port.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#5909



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?



#5909



I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5928**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#5928



I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#5928



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#5928



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important



#5928



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

public transport improved.

Better road

new lanes on the Harbour bridge



**#5930**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

no need to receive paper of information on water bill.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

That's a need.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

new lanes on the Harbour bridge

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

something happening here.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#5930**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

need

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#5930



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#5930



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#5930



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

better public transport options

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#5931**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

unclear benefit, loss of control over long term future of Port and its strategic value to Auckland



#5931



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

however, need to make sure it is value for money

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#5931



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	



#5931



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	



#5931



Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Feedback guide



**#5947**



The long term plan covers a wide variety of topics and we encourage everyone to read it through and give feedback. For Surface Light Rail, there are only a few key questions we would like you to comment on to give support to a surface light rail network.

The following document shows parts of the wider consultation document that are related to Surface Light Rail including what is anticipated for each level of council services/investment (ie Do less pay less, Central proposal, Do more pay more).

We have examples that cover key points for what we are working for but feel free to add in additional information, or context about how transport issues affect you, and why you support surface light rail in Auckland. Feel free to copy and paste, or reword to suit your preferences.

#### SLR's Key LTP Info

##### Overall Direction for Long-Term Plan - Question 1

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan

While this is primarily personal preference we would recommend putting "Do more" or "Other".

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

We would recommend putting "Do more" for transport

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I support further investment into a surface light rail rapid transit network starting with a route from the City Centre to Mt Roskill, and then further expansion to Onehunga, Māngere and other transport corridors such as the North-Western and Northern corridor. Any busway development along the North-Western corridor should be future-proofed for surface light rail upgrades. Consistent work over the last decade, reflected in Auckland Transport's Auckland Rapid Transit Pathway 2023 report, has shown that to effectively address Auckland's congestion issues we cannot rely solely on a bus network. The busiest bus corridors in our city are already reaching capacity, and the long-term plan should reflect that reality.

Additionally, I support Auckland controlling its own transport priorities. An "Auckland Deal" provides the means for central government to support Auckland Council's priorities, rather than the other way around. A surface light rail network would provide



**#5947**



opportunities for growth, development, and productivity in the city. I believe this should be included in the “Auckland Deal” with central government. I urge Auckland Council and the Mayor to make the development of a surface light rail network, starting with the City Centre to Mt Roskill line, a priority in such a deal.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I do not fully support this plan as it does not include investment and commitment to a surface light rail rapid transit network. Any work on a busway in the North-Western corridor should be future proofed for surface light rail and there should be commitment to surface light rail along the City Centre to Mangere corridor, starting with a City Centre to Mt Roskill line. I worry without this we will not be able to address Auckland's congestion issues as projected growth in these corridors would require higher capacity transport modes such as surface light rail.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

I want to see Auckland Council spending more to develop a surface light rail network, with a City Centre to Mt Roskill line constructed as a priority. There has been significant design work done by Auckland Transport and Waka Kotahi on surface light rail pre-2019. Adopting these plans will allow any work to be fast tracked with only minor updates and improvements needed. From this stage I would support expansion of surface light rail, such as what is proposed in Auckland Transport's Auckland Rapid Transit Pathway 2023 report. The line should be expanded to Onehunga and Mangere, and eventually to other transport corridors such as the North-Western or Northern corridors, upgrading any busway infrastructure. Staging the development of the network in this way ensures it remains affordable for Aucklanders and is practical to build.

Congestion is a major issue in our city that costs Aucklanders time and money. It restricts our growth and potential. Consistent work done over the last decade has shown that we cannot only rely on our bus network in our busiest corridors in order to address our cities transport issues. Surface light rail provides a higher capacity



**#5947**



solution that is affordable, deliverable, environmentally friendly, and will connect communities in Auckland. It provides a plethora of economic benefits that will create jobs and help businesses while improving our streetscapes to make our city a better place to live.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#5947



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Cruise ships need somewhere else to go, they can't keep impacting commuters.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

Cruise ships need somewhere else to go, they can't keep impacting commuters.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#5947



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know



#5947



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important



#5947



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

less road improvements ( except for crash sites) just maintain the current roading



**#6006**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

forget the dynamic lanes even on Lake road People have a choice /walk/cycle/rideshare/bus No more road improvements except where say history of crashes/accidents esp if involve pedestrians as they dont have seat belts or bumpers

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Yes the Tūpuna Maunga Authority the mountains are scared to some Maoris agreed but there is no urgent need for radical spending by the community as a whole I not against the authority but there is very little that can't wait - these mountains are not going to waste away Please reduce the meetings and your support of costs and overheads

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

do not sell AIA shares



**#6006**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

No change leave as is for a while longer to avoid inevitable costs of consultations and planning etc Leave alone again its not gining anywhere the opportunity iwill still be there

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#6006



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#6006



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#6006



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

Iwi samoans tongans chinesse indian all can have their say just like the colonists can there shpuld be no priority bqased on race or colour of ones skin

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

less redevfeolpment more refurbishment The new toilet block on the Parade at takapuna is a extrangant lot of money when the old ones were not derelict or dangerous What I am saying is less graneous project but maintain and re[air exisitng

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop upgrading pedestrian facilities when existing layout is sufficient.



**#6007**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

### Tell us why:

Motor vehicle volumes in AK are horrendous. Funding public transport is a priority just Get on with IT.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Having multiple agencies within the whole council operation who duplicate services resulting in additional costs

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

This community facility must be retained, maintained and rearranged. Fresh focus and new blood?

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:

## 4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



**#6007**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

A lot can change in 35 years. And what sort of figure are we asking for from this potential overseas operator?

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Imported cars/vehicles are an eyesore in a high visibility area around tourist transport hubs in the city. Get them off the wharf on transport trains after midnight to holding yards elsewhere

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#6007



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#6007



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#6007



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#6018**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Raised pedestrian crossings are a luxury but increasing public transport capacity and reliability is absolutely essential for the mitigation of congestion which has been spiraling out of control recently,

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More on public transport, to the detriment of traffic management. Public transport is the best way to reduce congestion and mitigate the costs such congestion causes.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

It sits empty most of the time, this space could be better utilised

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



**#6018**



**Tell us here:**

No-one is going to buy the lease for 2.1 billion dollars if they are not going to make more than that operating it. Sacrificing 35 years of operational profit for a smaller upfront payment and a temporary reduction in rates is short sighted and foolish. The wharf should remain in the hands of the auckland council and the profits should go towards the city, not private companies.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#6018



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#6018



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop further investment in parks & sports fields until Auckland Council is solvent. Sport field capex will not stop flooding or reduce crime. Auckland is broke and cannot spend money on leisure when we suffer flooding due to negligent drainage management.



**#6044**



Stop plans to sell our port, parking, roading and airport investments - this makes no sense. These assets are MONOPOLIES that bring revenue into council without the need to raise rates.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Transport spending has been a failure. Stop spending.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Auckland is broke and incapable of improving the stadium at no extra cost to ratepayers.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Council only understands spending more money - it lacks any skills to save or invest. This plan means any funds collected would be spent within 12 months.



**#6044**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

If foreign owners take over our port, we will lose control of this important monopoly. There will be security problems and endless labour strikes. Audit results monthly and dismiss poor managers without delay.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Council lacks any management ability. It is safer to save the revenue to reduce rates.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Council is unable to manage the port land. It would be a disaster to allow council to take over port land. Our economy will grow and we will need more port land.



#6044



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Council is not able to manage Bledisloe.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Other
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support



#6044



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Reduce councilors by 20% and stop replacing staff that leave.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support any priorities



#6044



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Not Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

No money = no projects

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Rubbish

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Public transport

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6060**



Road improvements

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport options

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#6060



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#6060



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#6060



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Not Important



#6060



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	Do more
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Surf lifesaving clubs play a vital role in our community, providing essential services to keep our beaches safe. However, many of these facilities are reaching end-of-life and are in need of replacement. Without adequate funding, our clubs will struggle to continue their lifesaving work effectively.



**#6068**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#6068



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	
---	--



#6068



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	



#6068



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our



#6068



community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

**Tell us why**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More recycling, commercial composting bins

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6101**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Don't think it's a top priority

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#6101



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#6101



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6101



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Very Important



#6101



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Clean oceans - no waste water overflows

Higher petrol prices

Congestion charge

Cycle bridge from the North Shore to the CBD



**#6108**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less road improvements for cars - divert money to public transport and cycle lanes and safe pedestrian crossings

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycleways and pedestrian crossings should be the number 1 priority. Look to Europe eg Stockholm for guidance.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycleways and safe crossings. Cycle bridge across the Harbour bridge.

Increase parking fees. Increase fuel duty. Congestion charge.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Nice smooth roads

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Should also be used for concerts and other events

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know



**#6108**



**Tell us why:**

This needs to be analysed in detail by financial experts. A medium and long term view is needed.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The port has high value land which should be redeveloped and capitalised on.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#6108



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in	Support



#6108



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#6108



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Good job on pedestrianise Takapuna.

Mauri and Iwi issues can be integrated with other activities eg arts and parks.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Clean water and oceans must be number 1 priority.

Open the pedestrian walkway along the sea from Milford to Takapuna



**#6108**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Activities and provisions that only benefit a few, eg golf courses.



**#6117**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Support for public transport is essential. Make it easier and faster. Deprioritise cars.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cars and roads

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#6117



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

Do not sell ownership to foreign entities

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#6117



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#6117



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest	Very Important



#6117



to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	I don't know
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#6134**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

I oppose the proposal to lease the operation of the port for 35 years for the following reasons:

- Disregards Expert Advice: The proposal ignores expert advice on the port's unsustainable location, as evidenced by the conclusions of the last three port studies.
- Hidden costs: Locking the port into its current location until at least 2060 will impose billions of dollars of road and rail costs on future generations as freight flows increasingly strain our already congested transport network.



#6134



- Long-term Impact: Prolonging the status quo until at least 2060 will prevent Auckland from realising the significant social, economic, and environmental potential we could achieve by transforming the industrial port zone into a thriving urban environment, as we've done with Viaduct Harbour and Wynyard Quarter.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
--	--



#6134



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



**#6134**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#6156**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I oppose the proposal to lease the operation of the port for 35 years for the following reasons:

- Disregards Expert Advice: The proposal ignores expert advice on the port's unsustainable location, as evidenced by the conclusions of the last three port studies.



#6156



- Hidden costs: Locking the port into its current location until at least 2060 will impose billions of dollars of road and rail costs on future generations as freight flows increasingly strain our already congested transport network.
- Long-term Impact: Prolonging the status quo until at least 2060 will prevent Auckland from realising the significant social, economic, and environmental potential we could achieve by transforming the industrial port zone into a thriving urban environment, as we've done with Viaduct Harbour and Wynyard Quarter.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	
---	--



#6156



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	



**#6156**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#6169**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#6169



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	Support



#6169



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#6169



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	



**#6169**



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Rubbish collection and disposal options. I’m sick of litter in my neighbourhood. Taking away options has made things worse.

Basic maintenance of parks and roadsides needs to be more regular. This sets the tone and builds pride for the city and neighbourhoods



**#6188**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less studies into things that are not absolute core business.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

AT appear to be spending money on things that we don't want. There needs to be a major reset before more funding approved.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Roadside maintenance, bus ways and conventional roads. Mill Rd.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised crossings, rail, radio advertising's campaigns, speed reductions, painting circles on road in Takapuna, installing island then removing these islands months later.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

The stadium was gifted to Council. It is a long term strategic asset that will cost \$100's of millions to replace.

Like any stadium usage is sporadic and it provides capacity for the city to host major events such as Commonwealth games, Football World Cup's, Rugby World Cups etc. The cost of \$3m per year over 10 years is totally reasonable given scale and value of asset.



**#6188**



Selling land adjacent would be extremely short sighted.

Please stop wasting money on reports, scheme plans, surveys etc regarding stadiums and get back to basics.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

There is no reason for Council to own minority stake in airport. A diversified fund is a better option for reasons stated in council plan.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Council not a good owner based on history.

Retaining land long term important.

Lease will provide good cashflow for Council.

Any lease needs to include safe guards to ensure port functions to agreed standards.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**



#6188



Rates burden is enormous and savings very much a luxury in cost of living crisis. Savings should be deferred until costs under control.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

We are in a cost of living crisis. We should focus on areas already underway first... ie Wynyard Quarter.

The port is strategic and land should be retained for port uses where at all possible.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Freight is critical to our everyday lives. We have an abundance of Harbourside amenity from Westaven to the Port and then out through the bays. Another few hundred metres it needed. More useful for port.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#6188



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#6188



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Not Important



#6188



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

New library study a waste of money and time.

I would prefer local board focus on basic concerns of community. Traffic, crime and maintenance.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Terrible, nothing about transport or basic services. Library proposal is totally ridiculous and waste of por ratepayers funds.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Suggest stick to basics. Don't change North Harbour stadium, don't build a new stadium. Don't sell land.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#6221**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Buses and busways

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Underground Rail

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Underused at the moment

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#6221



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#6221



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#6221



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Not Important



#6221



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Environmental initiatives

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6233**



Less spent on management

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

No clear solution in some areas eg: Lake Road

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Making public transport free

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

No stadium

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Do not sell assets in publicly funded organisations



**#6233**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Asset that needs overall management

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Need to raise revenue from this

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

More ferry berths needed

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#6233



Tell us why:

Jobs and industry focus

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#6233



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#6233



Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6264**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycleways should be prioritised. We need to reduce our use of cars in the city. Ferry services need to be restored so we reduce use of cars.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#6264



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#6264



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6264



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Very Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses	Very Important



#6264



and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Restore the Stanley Point ferry service.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Keep our libraries and cultural support programs for the youth

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6268**



Pay yourselves less please like free lunches or whatever unnecessary perks especially the mayor lower his pay

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Community projects

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#6268



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#6268



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Do not support



#6268



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Stormwater - avoid flooding

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

-More accessible transport



**#6276**



- Less town houses
- Reduce regional events

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Easy transport to airport

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Manholes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce cycle lanes

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Redevelop do recreation

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#6276**



Don't corporatise

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Airport better transport services

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#6276



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#6276



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Pleas ensure that

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Ōtara-Papatoetoe

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



**#6301**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

we need more cycleways, and cheaper public transport

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

i dint like the other options

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#6301**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

no

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#6301



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#6301



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

no

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important



#6301



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

A vast majority of council responsibilities are already underfunded. Further cuts are short sighted

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6324**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

North harbour stadium is wasted. Would be far better to develop a new stadium and cricket ground in a more central location to replace both Eden Park and North Harbour

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Selling off the asset of Auckland airport for short term gains is short sighted. Retaining ownership of assets for the long term is a far better idea.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#6324**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Mortgaging of returns from Ports of Auckland is short sighted

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#6324



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#6324



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

### Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#6324



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Very Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Fairly Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Follow through on proposed upgrade of Lake Rd North Shore, as this has been shelved in the latest transport plan.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6339**



We do not need more Raised crossings, from Waka Kotahi, keep with crossings as they are.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think we should be encouraging more cyclists, so need safe cycleways.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Cycleways, rapid transit to & from the airport & the city centre.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

It is under utilised & run down.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#6339**



I think we should hold on to the remaining airport shares land do not agree with the leasing of the operation of the ports of Auckland. How can we devote the land if it is leased out.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

What about moving the Port is this off the table now? There was a proposal to use this land for the people of Auckland to enjoy with open spaces. If the operation us leased this cannot happen.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

We need the money coming in to fund the necessary infrastructure now.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#6339



**Tell us why:**

We need to minimise the wharves so the people of Auckland can enjoy the waterfront spaces.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Reduce Ports of Auckland land holding.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	Support



#6339



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Waitematā

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?



#6339



I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



#6339



## Waitematā Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitematā in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road.	Very Important
Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works.	Very Important
Phased delivery of improvements for Heard Park.	Fairly Important
Deliver services and programmes that support youth activation, leadership, and wellbeing, particularly in Newmarket.	Fairly Important
Develop programmes that improve perceptions of safety within the City Centre, and our town-centres.	Fairly Important
Support local communities to develop Emergency Planning & Readiness Response Plans.	Very Important
Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible.	Very Important



**#6339**



Tell us why

**7c. What do you think of the Waitemata proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#6359**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Good facility, needs to be used more

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#6359



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	I don't know



#6359



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#6359



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important



#6359



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Key focus needed on environmental protection, clean waterways, arts and events and public transport. Library is fine as is, doesn't need replacing

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

NO

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#6360**



Reign in the spending on "nice to have's," rate payers are already stretched to the max. parades, funding speciality groups, sports etc are all very well but the core infrastructure like drains and footpaths, is where the concentration needs to be. less money wasted by Panuku and AT on pet projects would be nice.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

It depends on the cost of the rapid transit network, there are current assets needing upgrading for current basic infrastructure . There has been a lot of money wasted on transport solutions over the past few years, that have changed nothing and never progressing past the expensive designs and consultation process I would like to see the basics fixed first.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Drains , water projects, footpaths , undergrounding of electricity lines. basic good Street lighting. Cameras in public areas for safety.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Street beautification for the sake of it, parades, concerts, subsidies of events and grounds, changing signs into multiple languages, anything that takes money away from core infrastructure.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct,Change the operational management



**#6360**



**Tell us why:**

More use of the stadium by making it suitable for smaller events would reduce the ongoing cost to the ratepayer. Selling some excess land would pay for or towards the upgrade of the facility.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

I am not sure that selling all our income producing assets is a good idea, and if future use of the proposed fund would inhibit any future council from using it for vanity or legacy projects.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

I don't know if the Auckland Future fund idea would prevent abuse by future councils using it for pet or legacy projects that give little return back or worse still, waste the money on consultation and plans that never eventuate into practical use. A lot of this is already why we are in the position we now are Take Auckland Light rail down Dominion road as a prime example.



**#6360**



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Reasons already stated above it should be earmarked for core infrastructure replacement and repair.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Any change at this point would mean massive council spending to get the waterfront into a state where it was a good public facility and we can't afford that spending right now , this has the ear marks of a vanity or legacy project that we are not in a pos

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

as above no to legacy / vanity projects

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#6360



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#6360



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

NO

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Very Important



#6360



Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

We need to be using the limited budget available to deal with the upkeep and improvement of what we already have, not be adding projects that are costly nice to haves and/or funding of anything that is not absolutely necessary.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

That depends on the position we are in in 5 years

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Please do something about Lake Rd! There are times of day when we're basically trapped in our suburb - it can take 45 minutes + to travel 4km to Takapuna. Also I would love to see library funding increased. The budget for purchasing books has obviously been reduced - another \$50k could make an enormous difference.



**#6433**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

I think you could ease back on some of the town centre redevelopments and the road safety developments.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Public transport is a bit of a joke. The ferries are unreliable and often get cancelled at short notice. I'd use it more if it was more reliable.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Improving Lake Rd. Living in Devonport we get it both ways. Lake Rd is impassable at several times in the day whereas the ferries are unreliable - they can be full, run late or just get cancelled.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings unless there's evidence of it being actively unsafe for pedestrians in that spot.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Either get the community using it more or get rid of it.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#6433**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Sort out where the cruise ships go so they don't disrupt ferries. I'm all for leasing the port operation but not if it means that the Council cannot control how that land is used at all. And get rid of the huge cranes that aren't used and are just an eyesore.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I like the idea of using them for public benefit but without specifics on what that would be it's hard to argue we should do it. For example a stadium in that area? Yes please! Parkland? Probably not as a priority.



#6433



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

If it can be a new stadium I'm all for it. Sell the Eden Park land, sell North Harbour Stadium. Build a stadium right by where ferries, buses and trains terminate and where there are masses of dining options. Perfect.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6433



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?



#6433



I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Very Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Support better public transport so reduce cars on roads

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Creating roads and parking and new build



**#6460**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Make public transport reliable

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More regular buses

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised crossings, ,

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Ask the community what they need. Maybe sports fields, maybe open land maybe parking for bus and park and ride

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Don't sell airport shares. All money will disappear into the chasm and not make a difference. . Keep airport shares



**#6460**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Maybe this is a bad time to get the port back for the community. Money wise.

Perhaps later we can use our beautiful coast and sea for the benefit of all. Look at wellingtons beautiful coastal port. Shame Auckland is too poor.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

To get more from it creatively . Less buildings, more Community use of existing.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

In a cost of living crisis it is disheartening to know selling the silver just leaves our cupboards bare still.

Unemployed people can't pay the increasing burden and threat of rate rises.

Stop non-community oriented spending on roads and parking. Give buses , parks and libraries support. The Takapuna central reconstruction must have eaten a lot of funds. We don't need more motorways or roads.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#6460



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

More land for public use improves life

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Auckland has no centre or heart. This area could bring it. Viaduct has brought benefits to public and private.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to</p>	<p>Support</p>



#6460



reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

We needed 3 waters plan. Government needs to support this. Increased rates squeezes all. At least pay as you throw allows some ability to save while recycling.



#6460



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Fairly Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important



#6460



Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Some items are crucial and really helpful. Others are nice to have.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

All reasonable. Library and Becroft park important.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Look for the most good for the investment ,in social terms.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improve Lake Road with some kind of transit lane so that buses and multiple-occupancy cars have priority. Until it's quicker to go by bus people are not going to switch to public transport. Devonport/Belmont is going to become almost unlivable with the number of homes being built if this is not addressed quickly.



**#6477**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

I think the present focus on trying to make sure we get value for money is a good one. There's not a lot I think should be cut - sports and arts need support.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Road safety for pedestrians and cyclists is also important, so I'm wary of knee-jerk attempts to stop things like raised crossings. Certainly see if you can do them more cost-effectively, but it's important that kids can walk to school safely.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport improvements and getting more cars on the road.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

I don't think we really need it. There are stadiums elsewhere. Could the whole thing be sold and the funds used on things that will benefit the city more - improved public transport, support of sports clubs and continuing revitalising town centres.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#6477**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Diversification always makes sense in terms of investment. As long as the money is protected and not frittered away, and only profits are spent, I think it's a sensible idea.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I don't think I have enough information to decide. Would this impact on how we can use that land in the future. 35 years is a long time and if Auckland decides there is a better use of the land it will not be possible to change.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#6477



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support



#6477



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#6477



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

I would like to see really targeted spending on tangible things, whether it's events, libraries, sports clubs, toilets. For example the Takapuna revitalisation is starting to look quite good - try to keep up the momentum of that kind of thing. Getting more people into Takapuna will hopefully result in a better range of shops. Improving public transport and Lake Rd is my top priority but I guess that's not local-board funded. But that's where any spare money should be directed in my view.

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#6477**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Devonport-Takapuna

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Nothing, live within the current budget!

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less/no support for pressure groups.



**#6480**



Cut AT expenditure, no raised crossings they are a total waste of money adding to pollution and vehicle wear and tear, causing drive frustration and aggression.

Use more user pays for clubs, sports fields, libraries, swimming pools, etc

End council funded concerts, shows, outdoor movies, or charge for these to cover ALL costs.

Get back to basic council work ie. collect the rubbish, provide safe water and get rid of the sewerage.

Streamline consent work to reduce cost for that.

Stop funding damaged houses let people rely on their insurance and dont pay out for people uninsured.

Stop buying expensive electric cars and Busses use efficient small petrol cars and use smaller van type busses on low passenger routes.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

use smaller busses in residential areas of low usage.

Auckland roads are too narrow for bus lanes that sit empty most of the time with only 1 public lane beside them.

Use road berms to add xtra lanes cheaply on arterial and high use roads eg lake Rd Devonport.

Expand the hop card to work on all public transport.

Raised crossings are a waste of money as stated above total ban needed for these.

Cycle ways are a waste of money for their usage, NZ weather is not conducive to high cycle use

## **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**



#6480



Introducing smaller more efficient busses in urban areas, study demand patterns and adjust accordingly

## 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Council staff, working for a council is seen as a job for life where you dont have to do anything, change this mind set!!!!

Change to a user pay system so people can choose where they spend their money by stopping funding for sports fields, golf courses, pools, hero parades etc

Make clubs that use these fund them from users!

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

### Tell us why:

Dont spend the 33 million make the stadium self funding or lease it out to someone who can make it self funding, little old ladies [and men] dont use stadiums why should they fund them to the tune of 33 million????

sell or lease any adjacent land to help fund rate reduction!!

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:

Councils job is not managing shares or ports, release the equity asap and get it managed by people who know what they are doing so council can stick to collecting the rubbish not pulling out rubbish bins adding to dirty streets!!

Sell as much land as possible to add to the investment fund, any empty council land sitting doing nothing and lease the port on reduced land.



**#6480**



Dont sell 20 story buildings for 3million dollars again tho!! get professional people to handle these sales so market price is achived.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Councilors dont know much about running a port so get out of the business.

As a council owned business it has paid disgusting dividends historically.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

If the council continues to operate this there are unlikely to be any future dividends!!

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Council is not an insurance company and will be exposing rate payer to an unreasonable risk if they self insure, they do not have a mandate for this and should not now become an insurance without one. Recent weather events should be enough of an instruction for this to be seen as something beyond their means.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other



#6480



**Tell us why:**

Sell the wharves that are not being used and invest the money professionally.

Other option is to lease the wharves long term to a third party to develop but not include in the Port of Auckland wharf lease

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Lease this out for development now!!

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#6480



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Pay as you throw should be used for all rate payers, people who throw more pay more!!!

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna



#6480



## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Not Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Not Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Not Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Not Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Not Important

#### Tell us why



**#6480**



Most of these should either not be funded from rates but by the users.

There should be no more special treatment for Maori than any other group of the population making up 16 %.

Your valued art partners should be self funding not funded with rates from people with totally different interests, similar for rugby clubs golf courses etc

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Most of this is a load of rubbish, investing in community networks, environmental groups, promoting inclusion and diversity have no place in council funding eliminate all such expenditure!!!!

However selling unused or under performing assets is sensible and should be a high priority to contribute to reducing rates.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Stick to your core business of providing services that are essential for keeping people alive and dump all the other rubbish that you have become involved in in your drive for wokeness, grow up and realise that people will not fund this rubbish any more. Back to basics and you may get reelected??