



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

**Written Feedback  
Franklin Volume #1**

April 2024



<b>Sub #</b>	<b>Organisation Name</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
1821	Stevenson Aggregates Limited	798
1906	Cycle Coach Janet Stqk	806



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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 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?

roading

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

the fluffy stuff not involed with core business- roading/rubbish/community assets



**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?**

fix the roads we already have and ensure local expansion i.e drury/ramarama/paerata is actually matched by roading expansion

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

traffic calming/ speed restrictions

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

its a white elephant

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 control and returns from citys single international airport

**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?**



#6



<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>	Support
<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>	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>	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>	Support



#6



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

**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
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Fairly Important



#6



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very 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?**

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#6**



Great idea- lets see this targetted rate extend to other community led assets- like paying for local halls, even buying future community assets- i.e land

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

Ararimu

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Consider a plan to redesign North Harbour stadium as a multi-purpose space that can host test cricket in summer.

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



**#48**



Remove bureaucracy / red tape from processes to make things more efficient. This will help reduce headcount. Demand reading and infrastructure contractors improve their efficiency. Roding projects appear poorly project manager. Too many people standing around.

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

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

I support network optimisation but it doesn't go far enough. We could reduce costs without compromising worker safety

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

No. Central government need to come to the party

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

Cycle ways. I still think they are a good idea but we don't need rolls royce solutions. Safer streets has resulted in longer journeys.

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

Other

### **Tell us why:**

There is still no test cricket venue in Auckland. This is our opportunity to do something affordable that provides a solution for NZ cricket in our biggest city. Despite the 'far away' perception, people would travel for a once a year event. It could then be used by the community the rest of the year.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

Helps improve diversification of investment

**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?**



#48



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).	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	Do not support



#48



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?

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: Franklin

## 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:**



#95

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>	



#95



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?

Stop wasting our money on things that are not important.

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



Stop wasting money on things that are not important. At least 90% of the council need to be fired - they are hopeless.

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

Don't support any of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

You are wasting our money on everything that isn't important. Get back to the basics and get that right first.

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

People who can actually do their job.

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

Management. Get some real workers who can do their job.

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

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

It's barely used. Waste of 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:**



What makes you think any of your ideas are good ? They are not. Wake 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:**

Stop selling everything. Get better 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:**

Where else is the money going to come from? You have sold everything else because you are incompetent.

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

**Tell us here:**

Sack 90% of this council and we will see immediate improvements.

**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:**

Stop ruining everything.



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Stop trying to change everything. Any single thing you clowns touch turns to \*\*\*\*\*.

**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>



#126



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.	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.	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?**

All current council employees need to go. None of them are any good.

## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities



#126



**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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important



**Tell us why**

It would be good if Franklin wasn't part of Auckland council.

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

Ripping off the civilians.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Stop wasting our money

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

Waiuku

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

Sack all management of Auckland council.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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	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?

road maintenance and renewals

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



supporting greenfield developments

## 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, road maintenance and renewal

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

Electric charging stations, the private sector can provide this - Public transport is better bang for buck for emissions reductions

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Its underutilised and there are more than enough stadiums in the rest of 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)?

Other

**Tell us why:**

sell the shares but Levy higher rates on the Airport Precinct so that they are paying their fair share of the major transport investments (Airport to Botany) that will benefit their commercial operations.



**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:**



#135



**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>Support</p>



#135

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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Fairly Important



#135



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Very Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#135**



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

Hunua

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Better regulatory functions/accountability

Animal Control more funding

Waste management wheelie bins across the entire region quicker than proposed



Transport/maintenance/accountability

**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?**

Raised Pedestrian crossings so close to roundabouts and numbers

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

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Eden Park being able to have more concerts and being able to be used for more things other than rugby has meant more events/options for Aucklanders which is positive. So if a similar thing can be done at North Harbour Stadium by changing the operational management that can only be a good thing for our community and 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)?**

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 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.	Support
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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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	Fairly Important
---	------------------



#163



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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).	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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



All positive and I support

**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**

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Move away from contractors and have council staff that are invested in our community , contractors do a \*\*\*\*\* job

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



Stick to core business , move away from the fringe nice to dos

## 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?

Roads, Southern motorway in particular, how is it that Fulton Hogan has camped for years on the southern motorway and it still isn't finished

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

No more concrete zebra crossings and less of them you guys went nuts in Pukekohe , what a waste of money

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Its a white elephant

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Makes sense to use profit making ventures to establish a fund for the greater good of the region

**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:**



#165



**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 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>



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Not Important



#165



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

I don't think you are listening to us focus on the core things a council should deliver to its community not waste time, effort and money on \*\*\*\*\* we don't need or want

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

Spend the money you take Franklin residents in Franklin,



**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**

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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	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 supporting/propping sports and arts facilities. User should pay for these.



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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Regional fuel tax was never meant to be a permanent income. Users should pay tolls if the payment method can be less tortuous than the stupid Puhoi system. Collection of fees and fines should be a priority.

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

Cleaning streets and making them more accessible

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

Pavements and crossings without local user consultation

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

Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

Ratepayers should not be paying. Users should pay.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**

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?**



#169



<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 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>



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?**

I am sick of paying for what I do not want, use or need.

**Local board priorities**

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

Franklin

**Franklin Local Board Priorities**

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

I support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#169



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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

We are not doing the basics and cannot afford the nice to haves or councilors pet projects.



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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Targeted rates are just a way of getting more money. We are still paying for targeted projects that are long gone. Local boards are pointless in mega Auckland. We have not received any of the benefits we were promised when we were forced unwillingly into

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

Buckland

**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: Franklin

## 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>	
<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?

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

Stop giving preference to things Maori as we are a city of many nationalities.



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

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

The transport system in Auckland is not user friendly. Timetables for connecting needs to be looked at eg. buses going to Warkworth pull out of the Silverdale bus station just as buses from the City arrive.

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

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

Stop the Maorification of signage and remove the commentaries on buses.

## 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)?

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?**

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>I don't know</p>
---	---------------------



#173



<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>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>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>	



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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
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	Not Important



#173



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Funding should be allocated for other essential services, eg water, rubbish collections and footpaths. We live in a multicultural society and special funding for Maorification should not be given priority.

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

Maintain basic services.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Rates currently paid by ratepayers should be used for footpaths and not be separate. This would be a further increase to the rates. Rates paid need to be allocated to essential services only, not 'nice to haves'.



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

Beachlands

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

Continue with weekly rubbish collections. There is already a problem with rubbish being dumped on sides of roads and this will only get worse if rubbish collection services are reduced.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?**

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 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?**

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



#175



<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>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>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>



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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
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.	Very 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



#175



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Provided the targeted rate is used as advertised, this will ensure recreational paths can be prioritised.

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

Pukekohe East

**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: Franklin

## 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>	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?

sports fields

### 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?**

public transport and sports parks

**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?**

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 programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#177



<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>	Other
<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>	Other
<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>	Support
<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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important



#177



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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

ok

**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**

Clarks Beach

**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: Franklin

## 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>	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?

Better and cheaper public transport, smart housing intensification

### 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:**

**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?**

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:**

Good to start moving the port to another part of the country

**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>
--	----------------



#178



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>	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.	Support
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



#178



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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



#178



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.	Fairly 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.	Fairly 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.	Not 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?**

**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**

Maraetai



**#178**



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: Franklin

## 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>	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 public toilets and cleaning and maintenance. None are very nice to use at parks and town centres.

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



No more grass berms with trees. In new subdivisions these grass areas and trees are broken or ruined by car parking. Make concrete (attractive) paths and berms as also grass is often not mowed and it all looks uncared-for. Trees could be on personal property, in parks, on corners. Save some money and get creative.

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

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

get trains up and going asap. Driving from Pukekohe to Auckland is a logistic nightmare. Have to time when to leave and return. Train services have been out of service out here for too long. Getting to airport on time is also an issue.

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

Smaller Commuter buses to train stations

### 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:



Need a growth fund for future security. Has a big deposit to kick it off so must be governed well.

**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:**

New leasees wont have competing funding needs like the council does, so would be solid investment 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?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

AFF will be a visible investment for Aucklanders to follow results and have confidence that there is a backup for anything disastrous

**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:**

Crowded out potential port leasee does not allow for expansion of 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 <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	Support



#184



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.	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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through	Very Important
---	----------------



#184



<p>projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, ‘Belmont’ Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	Fairly Important
<p>Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).</p>	Fairly Important
<p>Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.</p>	Fairly Important
<p>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.</p>	Fairly Important
<p>Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.</p>	Fairly Important
<p>Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.</p>	Fairly Important
<p>Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.</p>	Very Important

**Tell us why**



**#184**



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

Happy with this long term view. Especially keen on service optimisation where under-utilised facilities are provided differently eg sell building or land and lease or co-partner services in better premises. Too much money will need to be spent to renew all facilities in Franklin's enormous area.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

I love the paths idea but could prioritise some essential services in areas of deprivation where these walking paths are out of reach and affording a cycle is out of touch thinking. Dont think Council has had a good look at services poverty in Pukekohe e

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

Pukekohe

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

Funding equity is essential.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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	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 some rifle ranges

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



Paying councillors

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We must continue to upgrade but picking on people who drive without sensible alternatives is silly

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

Rifle ranges

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

Lights

**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?**

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	Do not support
---	----------------



#193



<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>	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>	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>	Support
<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>	<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?**

## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

<p>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.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>



#193



board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (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.	Very 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**

Progress and improvement is important before things get to hard

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

Great , having a plan out much better than not

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



Increase it and get done projects done

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

Orere Point

**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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#215



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.	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: Franklin

## 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	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?

Less cycle ways and bus lanes



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Raised pedestrian crossings are a huge waist of money plus all the traffic management

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

Getting rid of fed tape

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

Cycle ways, bus lanes

**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:

**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

I don't know



#227



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).	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.	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.	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?**

## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

<p>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.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>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</p>	



#227



board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	
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.	
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Clarks Beach



**#227**



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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Release land for residential and community commercial development, thereby collecting contribution fees, GST, providing job opportunities and solving housing shortages.

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



Reduce large-scale road maintenance and focus on maintaining roads with heavy traffic/passenger traffic. Reduce the width of public sidewalks and green spaces in the community, and change it to a requirement that private land must have a certain proportion of green space to reduce the cost of maintaining public areas.

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

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

1. The city government should release more residential land and plan roads according to the integration rate, rather than upgrading the existing communities based on limited resources.
2. The bus/train fare is fixed at \$5/day on weekends.
3. Increase the speed of trains.

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

Accelerate building permit approval

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

Municipal government consultant fees, government staff salaries

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

Building new stadiums may be cheaper than maintaining them, and old venues can be sold.



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

increase income.

**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:**



The city council has poor action capacity and high costs.

**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>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>



#240



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.	Support
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?**

Regional special land taxes are borne by residents, businesses or other institutions within the area.

**Local board priorities**

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

Franklin,Papakura

**Franklin Local Board Priorities**

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

I support most priorities



#240



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

<p>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.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).</p>	
<p>Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.</p>	
<p>Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.</p>	



#240

Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

## Papakura Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.

We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual



#240



naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.	
We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.	
We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.	
Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.	

**Tell us why**

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

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

The accountability agency shall regularly publish inspection reports, monitor/review the timing and compliance rate of various tasks, and collect feedback from applicants/third parties.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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 less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
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?

new developments, more roads, wider roads

keep homeless people in one area, look after them.

don't throw them everywhere, made the mess



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

no need to change speed at all

Labour waste all the money

**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?**

population dispersion to new development area

**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:**

too expensive to maintain

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 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:**

need 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:**

need money

**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>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>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>	<p>Support</p>



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?**

district resident shall pay their own extra fund if they need

## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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	Very Important
---	----------------



#254



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Franklin shall supply more house to market for young families around Paerata area, by reduce land size to develop more smaller single houses, more livable community.

e.g. 200-300m2 land for 150-260m2 houses



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

more sport parks and facilities

**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**

Paerata

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

new development at Drury moves a lot faster than Franklin. if Franklin need more funding, new developments are needed. this helps to increase income from contribution, rate, business, education and entertainment.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#268



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#276



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: Franklin

## 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>	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?**

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)?**

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?**

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	Support



#277



<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>	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



**6b. Do you have 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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#278



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.	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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities



#278



**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.	Fairly Important
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very 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.	I don't know



## Tell us why

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

Thats a very long horizon, so I hope they are revisited inside 10 years. Developing strong community organisations should be central to long term plans. There is no way the Board can fund all the potential projects, but by leveraging community spirit and input, the funding can go a lot further.

### Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?

This is a very small price to pay to improve this important part of our environment for current and future residents.

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

Ness Valley

### 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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#283



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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#308



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#309



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#310



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#311



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#313



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#323



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: Franklin

## 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?

Strengthen and invest in active transport options.

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



I would like to see asset renewal funding prioritised and delivered perhaps with a temporary reduction on capital investment.

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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I think essentially sound although the reduced investment in active transport proposals is not supported - improved path and cycling connections is a must.

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

Raised pedestrian crossings in my view = improved public safety.

### 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:

Like the proposal as it ensures that recreational need is still a priority and sustainable.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 support the principle and continued investigation into this option - let's have greater detail. Greater evidence required to ensure that a fund like this cannot be manipulated by politicians and frittered away.

**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:**

Totally unconvinced by the Mayor's argument for 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:**

Return on investment should be used for the benefit of all of Auckland.

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

**Tell us here:**

Continue to invest in active transport options and pedestrian safety.

**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 convinced that the Mayor has community benefit at the front of mind.



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Continued financial returns for Aucklanders.

**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>



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.	Support
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

## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities



#325



**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
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Fairly Important



### **Tell us why**

Priorities appear balanced and reflective of the present need for one of the regions fastest growing board areas. Continue to advocate for increased investment into Franklin by Governing Body.

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

They are good and I think further investment in public transport needs strengthening - bus and train services must be invested in and marketed to the community. Franklin's major arterials are choked.

### **Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Franklin's growth now and in the future is significant and it is in my view important to provide the community with appropriate active transport options. The priority paths identified and the board is urged to continue their investment into the future. Th

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

Waiuku

### **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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#336



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#337



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#339



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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#343



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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#345



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.	Other
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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#351



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#352



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#353



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#354



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#355



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#358



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#361



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#363



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#365



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#366



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#367



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#370



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



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>	



#371



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



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>	



#372



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



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>	



#374



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#375



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#376



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#378



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#379



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#380



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



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>	



#381



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#382



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#384



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#386



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#387



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#388



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.	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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#389



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.	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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Fix the roads and public transportation

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

Libraries, pools, etc



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Need better public transportation

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

Roads and public transportation

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

Parks

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Needs to be better utilized

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

Good 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:**

Get rid of the port at the current location

**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:**

Get the port out of the city

**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:**



#391



**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>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>Do not support</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?**

## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Not Important



#391



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Fix the roads and better public transportation

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#391**



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

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#403



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



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?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Sell the thing

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 shares and reduce debt

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

Other

**Tell us here:**

Sell off ports



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:

Sell assets and pay down 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?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell it

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

Other

Tell us why:

Sell it

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



#473



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.	
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.	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.	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



#473



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important



#473



Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

\*\*\*\*\* ridiculous

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

Awhitu



**#473**



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: Franklin

## 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	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?

Environmental policies

### 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:**

People will not get out of cars until public transport improves. It not about the cost of it, it needs to go where people need to go

**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?**

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:**

If it's a state owned asset all proceeds should go back to the community

**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>Support</p>
---	----------------



#501



<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>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>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>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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
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	Fairly Important



#501



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	I don't know
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.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Beachlands

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?

develop more trails in Franklin as proposed by our local ward

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 congestion makes train services essential and need to be improved. It also means bus lanes need to be increased

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

reducing fares for students and elderly and community card holders

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

roads

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i rarely visit the north shore and never the 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)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't have enough knowledge of how the fund would be run or its governance.

**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:**

Provided the lease agreement is financially sound

**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:**

Ideally some of the existing port activity could be transferred to Tauranga and thence by rail to other regions. Less trucks on Auckland roads.



#534



**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>Support</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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Very Important



#534



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#534**



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

Clevedon

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?

everything except waste, water and roads



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stop wastfull spending on humps and cycle ways

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

waste and water

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

cycle ways and humps.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Save our money to spend on more important 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:**

**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?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in	Do not support
---	----------------



#557



<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>	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>	Do not support
<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>	<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?**

## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

<p>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.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>



#557



board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not 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?**

**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**

Clarks Beach



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

concentrate on waste, water, 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: Franklin

## 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 less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<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?

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

We live in the semi rural Deep South of Auckland and a minimum of 30 minutes drive by car from the closest rail station, assuming we can find a car park when w3 get there. And assuming a train le@ved as per timetable. I have no confid3nc3 that this would ever be d3liver3d.

### 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:

As I understand it the stadium charges are too exp3nsive for all but major events.

It needs to charge at an appropriat3 lev3l for th3 ev3nts th3 community will support.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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's essential that rate payers at the t8me of a major adverse ev3nt are not solely responsible for th3 cos5 imp@ct of that ev3nt.



**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:**

Assuming the Auckland Future Fund will be able to generate a greater return after tax than retaining full control of the port and its operational risks.

**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 bigger the Auckland Future Fund the greater the risk spread.

**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:**

Transferring the two smaller wharves will have little impact on port capacity.

However a dedicated cruise ship terminal is needed that doesn't impact on passenger ferry operations.

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



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Bledisloe could become the dedicated cruise ship terminal with its own tr@nsport hub.

**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	Support



#572



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.	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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through	Fairly Important
---	------------------



#572



<p>projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, ‘Belmont’ Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.</p>	
<p>Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>

**Tell us why**



The two areas I do not support add no value to the wider community with increased spending.

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

Light on specifics.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Would support if this was targeted to areas where the expenditure was needed.

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

Glenbrook Beach

**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: Franklin

## 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	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:**

We need to remove costly wasteful spending from AT.

**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:**

Have never being 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)?**

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.	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



#600



<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>	Support
<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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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
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).	Fairly Important



#600



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

More are needed to remove the competition with vehicles on the roads.

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

Clarks Beach

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?

Our entire infrastructure needs to be invested in, especially as the city keeps growing. We need to plan ahead.

### 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:**

Our entire infrastructure needs to be invested in, especially as the city keeps growing. We need to plan ahead and budget for this.

**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:**

Our entire infrastructure needs to be invested in, especially as the city keeps growing. We need to plan ahead and budget for this.

**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:**

Our entire infrastructure needs to be invested in, especially as the city keeps growing. We need to plan ahead and budget for this.

**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:**

Our entire infrastructure needs to be invested in, especially as the city keeps growing. We need to plan ahead and budget for this.

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

**Tell us here:**

Our entire infrastructure needs to be invested in, especially as the city keeps growing. We need to plan ahead and budget for this.

**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 harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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



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.	Support
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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through	Very Important
---	----------------



#634



<p>projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, ‘Belmont’ Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>

**Tell us why**



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

**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**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?

Safe cycleways in rural locations. Allow buses to carry bicycles. Better quality of road surfaces i.e. less use of chip seal and more asphaltic concrete. Direct ferry from Pine Harbour to Waiheke. Extend passenger train services to Waiuku.



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

Spending on movies in the parks, have-a-go days, cultural events.

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycleways are good for reducing carbon emissions, providing exercise and removing cars off roads. Raised crossings are a safety feature - safety should not be compromised.

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

Cycleways, trains to Waiuku, ferry service from Pine Harbour to Waiheke.

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

Road surfaces involving chip seal. They are noisy, generate waste in the form of flying stones cracking windscreens, and do not last as long as asphaltic concrete.

**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 not in my local community but appears to be an underutilised 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:**

The present arrangement of control is in the hands of councilors, each has their own agenda which does not always equate for the greater good.

**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 should not be owning and operating a port - its outside the core area of responsibility for 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:**

A good income source for the Auckland 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?**

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 rather old wharves that could have more attractive public uses.

**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:**

Bledisloe is better used for something that provides 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>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>



#653



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.	Support
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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities



#653



**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
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Very Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important



**Tell us why**

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

I am in support of the key priorities.

**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**

Maraetai

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Yeah get rid of all foreigners in my Aotearoa immediately.

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

Yeah pay cuts to all administration workers immediately.



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

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Waste of money.

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

Yeah local Maori Doctors and Nurses.

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

Yeah housing development corporations.

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Waste of 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:**

Leave it alone so we keep our assets.



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

Other

**Tell us here:**

Keep ownership and charge fees to all foreigners.

**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:**

Invest in Maori owned enterprise's only.

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

**Tell us here:**

Yeah Nah looks like money wasting councils getting paid for nothing.

**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:**

Simply put to save wasting money.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



Public will never benefit from any council operations.

**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>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>	<p>Do not support</p>



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?**

Yeah stop wasting money on greedy National Party politicians and foreigners.

## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

**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	Not Important
---	---------------



#668



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Because Tangata Whenua deserves it and not any foreign businesses.



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

A load of money wasting.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Yeah giving money to useless councillors.

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

Pukekohe

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

Yeah give me the \$100.00 card or voucher immediately.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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	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?

Stop wasteful spending, the amount of things that are done in this council that are completely useless is mind blowing and that's not starting with Auckland transport

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



Wasteful spending. The amount of money spent on contractors in your organization who do nothing it's ridiculous. Get real and sort it out with procurement managers who know why they are talking about

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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

The city doesn't work. You can't get anywhere 80% of the time. You have lost trust with people using public transport because it doesn't work. Stop wasting money on stupid road designs and infrastructure that doesn't serve a purpose

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

Carparks near public transport hubs, giving people incentives to use public transport or car pool

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

Stupid road ideas. For example Pukekohe roundabouts are not only a waste of money but a death trap waiting to happen, have already seen a young school kid almost get collected by a car

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Other

### 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:**

Your trying to generate money by selling assets. Investigate the running of council and save money first. I know first hand how much money is wasted in council

**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:**

Don't sell your asset but lease it to generate income. But back to house investigation into wasteful spending, it's every where you look 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:**

You need to address things now so the money needs to be at hand and ready

**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:**



Your spending money for an idea that you don't even have. Wasting money for an idea? No

**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>Support</p>



#698



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.	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.	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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities



#698



**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
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important



## Tell us why

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

Where do I start,

1. Your procurement people need to change contractors and stop getting ripped off. To many projects get done around here with a price tag that is 4 times what it should be
2. Stop trying to create city with walkable roads and one way streets, we use the city to move and work and you try to slow it down
3. Use local business to support any works that need to happen. Constantly watching large out of town contractors come in when locals struggle
4. Clean up out parks and facilities
5. More money spent on crime prevention and locking crimanals away

### Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?

The 2 stupid round abouts and one way trial could have paid for this. Stop wasting money and asking for money to do things

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

Pukekohe East

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

STOP WASTING MONEY AND RATES WONT HAVE TO GO UP. STOP PAYING YOUR USELESS ELT PEOPLE THE AMOUNT YOU DO WHEN THEY CAN NOT DO THEIR JOB PROPERLY



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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	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	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?

put in a rail system that connects all parts of auckland and build a new bridge to the North shore, the one we have is past its date and is dangerous.

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



Stop silly road "improvements" the raised crosswalks are causing more congestion in Pukekohe, you also put in giant roundabouts that no one can use, drive over and break so your now just paying to have them fixed every week. Stop changing speeds and adding in speed cameras have the police go look for real criminals with their time. Stop trying to bring everyone into the central city you are causing issues, move business's, transport ect into different areas across the city to spread the load, this will reduce traffic, pollution, infrastructure requirements ect. All great cities around the world have multiple hubs rather than just one massive overcrowded center. Walking centres over must use car spaces

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

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

The CRL was an idiotic choice when there is a much higher need for trains connecting other areas of Auckland, e.g airport to CBD, East to West, Orewa to CBD. Why are you trying to drive more people into the city centre, spread out the load across the city stop trying to compact people in a small space.

Most bike lanes I see are completely empty or bikers use the road anyway so they have no point, you are putting in raised crosswalks when the old ones worked just fine.

Do Not put in a congestion tax, many people do not have an option to work outside the city bc you are trying to drive all the business into the city. You have created a problem and now want us to pay for it, There is no public transport where I live, I have to go into the CBD office drive at peak times bc of my set work hours can barely afford to live now and you want to increase how much I have to pay to o my job. I would be better off going on the benefits and staying home every day.

I do not believe you have made proper decisions on how you have spent money to date so I do not have faith that you would do this properly now.

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

No, reduce unnecessary spending and wasted money on projects that go nowhere, make your internal operations more efficient. I have insider knowledge of the amount of projects that are started and stopped after millions are spent. You bring in consultants on multimillion dollar contracts to tell you things you already know. Sort



your \*\*\*\*\* out on the inside before asking more from rate payers. This DOES NOT MEAN get rid of your staff, it means fixing process, business rules and tech out.

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

Literally everything you do.

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

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Sell it to an external company, why are you trying to run a stadium?! Have someone else deal with this it is not a government 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:**

seems like a sound investment, However do not have this run by any government organisation. Have an actual investment company do this, you do not know how to run things efficiently and would most likely loose money

**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:**



it will end up being bought by a foreign company which would mean all profits would go overseas and no tax would be gained in NZ. The estimate you have provided in what you might get for this is wayyyy over blown.

**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 current way council is run is inefficient, maybe in the future you would have sorted this out and can make better choices so I'd rather wait to spend the money.

**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:**

You can develop other areas for public use outside of the CBD stop concentrating on a single area of AUckland! The region is massive

**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?**



#713



<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>Do not support</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?**

Buses are not climate options.... Do Better

**Local board priorities**

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

Franklin

**Franklin Local Board Priorities**

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

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#713



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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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



**#713**



**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**

Pukekohe East

**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: Franklin

## 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	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 most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

Phasing out fossil fuel powered transport and introducing electric buses, Improving ferry services. eg insisting that any provider of ferry services must include week end service. Provide car parking at public transport network hubs. (Send someone to H.K or Singapore to see how it's done.)

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

Car parking in CBD and surrounds. Disincentivise CBD parking by whatever means are available. Phase out parking meters and wardens

## 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:**

Shareholding in AIAL is stockmarket speculation. Not any part of the Council's core responsibilities.

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



Other

**Tell us here:**

Council ownership should be maintained but the lease period is too long.

**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

Support



#726



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>	
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



#726



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?**

Howick

### 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 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	



#726



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.	

**Tell us why**

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

I support most priorities

**Howick Local Board Priorities**

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

Fairly Important

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

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	Fairly Important
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	Fairly Important
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	Very Important



#726



<p>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.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>Develop a community-led climate action plan.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>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.</p>	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Howick 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: Franklin

## 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, cant afford t.o pay more

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



stop all costs based on race. stop the huge payments to Maori for non essential work on our volcanic cones !

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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I support urgent repairs to the roading but opposed to the excessive costs to the raised pedestrian crossings. The painted ones have served there purpose and are cost effective. The cycle lanes will have to wait until they can be afforded.

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

Not till we can afford them.

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

Consultants !

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### Tell us why:

When we are more financial improvements could happen. Concerts could also be held there in summer months. Parking could be used when no events are scheduled.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 can see the funds being spent on project that are not essential. keep 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:**

They are Aucklands gateway to the world. There are plenty of options already at/on the waterfront but catering to Tourists instead of Auckland ratepayers is not what we should be doing.

**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 time is not right for investments and as said I dont trust that ratepayers would have enough input. Also due to climate change, we are going to have higher sea levels, more extreme weather events and this will affect all waterfront operations.

**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:**



Climate change.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

There is only a small percentage of Aucklanders that get any benefit from the massive spending of waterfront facilities.

**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>



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.	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.	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.	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?**

If this includes the extra cost of \$52 on rates for paths, crossings etc that will be charged to ALL ratepayers in Franklin I am against this. Rural ratepayers do not have or want these. User pays GST was justified by being fair, if you dont have or use you dont have to pay !

**Local board priorities**

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

Franklin



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

#### 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.	Fairly Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important



Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

For the last 30 years I have been a rural resident and ratepayer. I do not have or want footpaths, street lights, crossings etc. I have my own water, sewerage and stormwater path. All I really get is rubbish collection and to drive mainly from Patumahoe t

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

The priority must be in keeping our top quality rural land as growing land for food. There has been far too much subdivision which has resulted in traffic problems and motorway congestion. The amount of new housing going in Drury and Paerata and Karaka should be sufficient fo the growth.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Have already said Rural ratepayers should not be charged, User pays .and we do not use ! It is time for fairness and we have already paid too much towards other peoples facilities.

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

Patumahoe

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

One of the reasons I bought here 30 years ago was there was to be no more subdivision of rural land. Franklin Council was forward planning but along came our forced entry into the Super City and since then life has gone downhill fast.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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 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?

Efficient and reliable recycling options

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



Wasting money on roadworks that need to be redone in less than 6 months because it wasn't done correctly

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

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

The vast majority of the "improvements" seem to be restricted to Auckland City Central, not the outlying suburbs (such as Franklin) or attempt to "fix" problems that aren't there. Public transport is as unreliable now as it was 12 years ago when I tried to use it regularly. I don't think you should be spending billions of dollars on making it better when you haven't managed to fix it with the billions of dollars you've spent over the previous 12 years. I would want to see a well researched, well reasoned, comprehensive report on how to make public transport work better before so much money was spent.

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

Helping individuals in the community who are suffering (experiencing homelessness, poverty, other serious impediments to living their lives)

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

Move some money away from rugby and netball (at all levels) towards other sports/making children's sports teams more accessible to more people (eg- they can afford to send their child to these things)

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

Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

I don't live in north harbour, I don't know how it's used now, but I would assume the people of North Harbour have some relevant opinions



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 assume you pay people who have actual experience and knowledge on investment strategies- I would listen to them. As long as there are strict guidelines on who can access funds and for what (and how much).

**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?**

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>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>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>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>Other</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</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.	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.	Support
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 response options given here don't allow for all possible responses- you're not giving much room for nuance. For example- the WQTR question doesn't give us a way to say we would want this is to not be reduced, but for more money to go towards this project.

Your question about business rates is also worded in such a way as it could mean you will increase what businesses are expected to pay, but could also mean you will decrease what they pay.

Do better, be clearer.

**Local board priorities**

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

Franklin



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

#### 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.	Fairly Important
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.	I don't know
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Very Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not 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.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Again, not much room for nuance in these response options. Reducing rubbish bins/relocating them is a waste of time and energy. If anything they need to be increased.

You say you want to ensure young people can access services, yet you've shut down the y

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Almost all foot paths in Pukekohe are dangerous and/or broken. Many elderly people I know wont walk anywhere because they physically can't. Many kids can't ride bikes/scooters. I think a priority should be given to fixing existing paths before building ne

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

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?

Public transport and urban replanning/fixing of the really messed up train system we have currently.

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



Why are we paying the Auckland mayor to travel? Experts plan in their area of expertise, political over seas shoulder rubbing does not help the day to day person.

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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Get the petrol tax back - Auckland needs all of the plan, and not increased rates.

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

Sort out the rail network.

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

Politicking. I don't care of the symbol of Auckland city or mail heads. Do not undo Māori language signing, leave it as is.

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

I don't know

### Tell us why:

I live South, this does not help nor impact me.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

This is for experts to decide - not a registered nurse.



**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?**

I don't know

**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:**

Why the \*\*\*\*\* would you propose more truck shipments when our traffic is insane and roads already stuffed, or trains when you can't even keep the rail ways open as is!?!? How is this even an option proposed?



#742



**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>
<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>I don't know</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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

**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
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	I don't know



#742



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know
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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	I don't know
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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Do not get rid of rubbish bins, this is very short sighted and causes the problem to be moved rather than addressed.

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



**#742**



**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**

Ararimu

**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: Franklin

## 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 less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<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?

Improving infrastructure of parks and reserves, stop dropping the standards. As more and more people have less and less land, parks and reserves are essential for recreation, mental health, physical health and growth of community and children.



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

Stop spending so much money on Auckland Central, there is an unfair devision of money, we don't need more done in the centre which means people travelling, we need to make pockets all around Auckland to support the community, which would involve less use of transport/roads etc

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

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I like the enhanced satus quo. I do not think we should be spending money on enhancing the port areas at this stage. More money again going on central auckland! People would have to travel to use it, I would like to see more decentralization of Council.

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

Satellite projects rather than lots of money for central Auckland

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

Central Auckland

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Don't need to make changes yet.



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 investment portfolio situation. I do not believe in selling assets.

**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:**

Do not like the Auckland Future Fund at all.

**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:**

More transparency less risk.

**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 is this constant drive to spend money on central Auckland. We do not want to travel to utilize the facility. It becomes available only for those few. Satellite developments of parks and reserves, beaches, community growth, so that people do not h

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**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



#747



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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.	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.	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?

Franklin



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

#### 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
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).	Fairly Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important



#747



Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Do not reduce maintenance costs, we need grass areas and we need to keep rubbish bins and frequent emptying. Reducing costs in these areas lowers the standard of enjoyment for people and ends up costing more to maintain. It takes away pride of the commu

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

Excellent to develop community facilities and parks. Waste of money paths and transport. Excellent to support local groups developing environmental protection.

**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**

Glenbrook

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?



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:**



**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.	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



#749



<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>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>



**#749**



**6b. Do you have 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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Transport, water and parks (but not community) and environment but want to see genuine delivery of outcomes.

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



Would prefer to pay nothing/reduce investment completely in city and local development economic and cultural development and minimise council support to lowest level legally allowable. These are not appropriate spends during cost of living crisis.

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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Don't support network actions such as paywave - no evidence this is required and HOP cards work well. Do not support introducing capped weekly public transport passes unless they apply to all Auckland residents (not visitors) - otherwise this disadvantages those pushed to the edges of Auckland through high housing costs and advantages (richer) central and inner city residents. Happy to stop some previously-planned initiatives. Support network optimisation.

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

Network optimisation.

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

Paywave (HOP cards are perfectly adequate). Do not support introducing capped weekly public transport passes unless they apply to all Auckland residents (not visitors) - otherwise this disadvantages those pushed to the edges of Auckland through high housing costs and advantages (richer) central and inner city residents. Happy to stop some previously-planned initiatives.

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

Other

### Tell us why:



Keep it as is (or reduce maintenance costs) or sell it/redevelop for housing/open space. How many stadiums does Auckland seriously need? They are a luxury not an essential.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

Auckland Council doesn't know anything about operating a port - and clearly there are significant safety and cultural issues at the port. Let someone else address these but maintain interest in the underlying 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:**

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

**Tell us here:**

Don't allow fund to be managed by Auckland Council staff - outsource to experienced fund managers who are professional and decisions not influenced by political



considerations. Set initial "constraints" i.e. around certain types of investment but then don't interfere.

**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 programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	Support



#750



reduce the 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>	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.	Support
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?**

Franklin



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

#### 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.	Fairly Important
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important



#750



Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

New resident to area but don't seem particularly focussed/targeted. Would prefer bulk of investment in environmental protection/programmes.

**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**

Beachlands

**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: Franklin

## 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	As proposed
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?

The roads are disgusting full of pot holes and slips in franklin. This needs to be sorted out asap

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



Actually sort everything out and stop wasting money on cycle plans and not going ahead with them and putting in roundabouts in silly places. The public toilets in Pukekohe have been out of order for over two years its a joke. The playground in waiuku are also a joke. Spent all that money to provide nothing

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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

There is no public transport where i live basically so I have to drive so look into public transportation in Waiuku. So how are you going to improve that

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

Stop spending money in the more affluent areas and ignoring franklin

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

AS above

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

Considering having parking options at the stadiums there is a lack of parking and the transport system in Auckland is a big joke

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 just waste money so anything is better than what it is now

**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:**

No keep ownership and keep the profits to re put back in to 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:**

There are massive things that need to be done, re roads, prevent flooding ect ect

**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:**

No we need to increase traffic through the port as NZ is in the middle of nowhere



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

WE need the port to operate for export and import. Along with the cruise business

**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>



#770



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.	I don't know
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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities



#770



**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
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly 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**

You need to actually have facilities in Waiuku there is none and what we have is a rubbish. Look at the parks what a joke and the roads where are you fixing this. Why do we still have rubbish bags in 2024

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

Needs to be re looked at

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Im not sure about this but i think there are other things more important

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

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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?

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

Stop wasting money on projects, like pedestrian crossings on roundabouts. School children still don't use the crossings. Holds up traffic, Drivers get frustrated, this road rule is never adhered to, people walk straight out onto the road without looking.



"The diamond shape before a pedestrian crossing is there to warn motorists that they are approaching a crossing and also for pedestrians who must not step off the kerb on to the crossing if a vehicle has passed over the diamond."

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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Raised pedestrian crossings, don't reduce traffic they cause a build up of traffic.

There are very few cyclists in our area, waste of money doing cycle lanes

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

Making firms accountable for the lengthy time it takes to complete jobs. All road works take years to finish, thinking back in years, they had less equipment and completed the works faster and the roads lasted longer.

### 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?

Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

The council are renown for building elaborate places and then in a few years, either tearing them down or selling them.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

People, companies that run council projects don't have very good track records.

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

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

People, companies that run council projects don't have very good track records.

**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:**

It would depend on what the council want to use these wharfs for.

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

Other



**Tell us why:**

It would depend on what the council want to use these wharf for.

**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>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>



#774



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths 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.	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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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	Fairly Important
---	------------------



#774



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

On the way to 15min cities - Not appropriate. The elderly that rely on others to get them to appointments and cannot walk all over, they need closer parks to get to what is important to them and their quality of life.



Advocate for the Governing Body appro

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

Some good, some not appropriate at all.

**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**

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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>	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?**

Southern motorways and southern roads. They are winding and below average condition, yet are being travelled more frequently due to increased housing developments south of Auckland.

**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?**

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



#784



<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>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>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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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
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	Fairly Important



#784



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not 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?**

**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**

Clarks Beach

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Living rural I’m more interested in maintaining the roads over improving public transport Id pay more for road maintenance but think the big logging and quarry companies should be shouldering alot of this cost too

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



Not really hard to think of anything - just need to ensure every dollar is didn't effectively, no waste on projects that don't get traction or half measures on temporary pothole fixes that last a few weeks before they need redoing

**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 effective and efficient use of current resources - less wasteful spend, make every dollar count and have accountability to your ratepayers

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

Less pedestrian crossings and urban cycle ways needed in my view

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Need to focus on core services and transport/roads over big ticket projects at the moment while in cost cutting mode

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Do both - part investment and part fund current 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?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I do t know enough to comment

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



#798



**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>
<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>Support</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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Very Important



#798



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know
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?**

Need to review in more detail

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#798**



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

Clevedon

**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: Franklin

## 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	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 focus on core council responsibilities, ie infrastructure, building consents, and libraries.

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



Non-core activities, matariki, movies in parks, seismic upgrades (while in serious budget crisis).

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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Should eliminate spending on cycling outside central suburbs and focus on options that include access/better access to parking for public transport, ie park and ride schemes for outlying communities, ie Pokéno, Rodney, and Waitakere.

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

Better access to and more reliable public transport, trains with park and ride facilities further from CBD than Manurewa.

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

Walking and cycling tracks beyond 15-20 kms from cbd. Nonsense to expect population to cycle from new developments in Rodney or Ramarama.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

Doesn't serve most Aucklanders with limited sport or 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:**

Assets provide ongoing source of council income. Selling for short term gain is not a good long term solution. Also removing assets from public influence, ie non elected officials is undemocratic.

**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:**

Assets provide ongoing source of council income. Selling for short term gain is not a good long term solution. Also removing assets from public influence, ie non elected officials is undemocratic.

**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:**

Assets provide ongoing source of council income. Selling for short term gain is not a good long term solution. Also removing assets from public influence, ie non elected officials is undemocratic.

**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:**

Getting access to the wharfs for development into residential or commercial facilities does not benefit public in any way nor make city more attractive.

**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).	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.	Support



#818



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.	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.	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.	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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities



#818



**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.	Not Important
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important



#818



Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.

Very Important

**Tell us why**

Changing park names and replanting are not the services

The community wants or needs

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

Don't reflect the actual concerns of the community. Sound like proposal from management in cbd.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

What is the purpose of paths, especially in the midst of a cost of living crisis?

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

Buckland

**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: Franklin

## 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?

More rates increase less money people have to spend on theatre arts and visits to cbd. Take a look at overseas the impactt

Less wasteful spending by council on consultations and projects more cost efficiency with public funding more accountability would mean money used efficiently something currently not happening



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

Waste public money on pointless projects and not being efficient and accountable with public money

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

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Waste of time public transport never see anyone on a bus.. ferry price now too expensive . Don't go near where majority of people live or work people need to go. Majority of traffic is business and lorry traffic so won't change school runs needed for those having to take children to daycare or school as school buses over crowded not enough seats for kids to sit safely. My child travelled in stair well as full bus everyone standing.

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

Training properly staff ie road builders do the job properly first time not have to retarmac or dig up road again as not done correctly first time huge waste of funds.

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

Arts and events

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Waste of money to build a waterfront stadium no transport to area except train that don't work or actually run to take people home. Better to have north harbour as a northern based stadium under used unlike the Horrendous waste of money spend on



knocking silos down for boat yards for the americas cup never used waste of public funds again another white elephant

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**

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>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>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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>



#819



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.	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.	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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities



#819



**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.	Fairly Important
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	Not Important



**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Better spend on upgrade to roads and maintaining pavements

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Less spending



**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:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**

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?**

**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	Other



#834



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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).	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.	Other
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.	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.	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?

Papakura

## Papakura Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.	Not Important
We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.	Fairly Important
We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.	Fairly Important
We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.	Fairly Important



#834



Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.

Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Papakura 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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#882



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.	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: Franklin

## 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	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?



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:**

north shore is only one part of the auckland city.

There are other prior

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**

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

**Tell us why:**

this defines auckland

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Auckland is central and port city

**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



#906



<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>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>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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

**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
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	Very Important



#906



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?

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?**

Make downtown CBD a no car zone, only tram from top of queen street to the bottom, take away the cars.

**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:**



**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>	
---	--



#907



<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>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>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>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 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>	



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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
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	I don't know



#907



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know
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.	I don't know
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Pokeno

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?

No

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

Reduce head count of layers of middle management. Your IT costs are ridiculous.



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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

The roads we have provide us the ability to put mass transit above them. Show some vision. Cable cars can easily go above the road and are capable of taking people off the roads and moving masses. You haven't taken the idea seriously enough. It will be a point of difference for Auckland and solve the problem

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

Cable cars moving people East to West above the existing arterial roads that terminate at bus and train stations. Also North to South over the motorway if trains cannot be approved.

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

No

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

Other

### Tell us why:

Sell it. Someone else can redevelop or repurpose 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:



**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:**

Rate payers need some relief. The population is ageing and rate rises are continued stress on all with fixed incomes

**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:**

We need to develop Auckland for future growth. We are growing and we need better public spaces to be continually regenerating for our growing city.

A public saltwater pool (with clean water) would be a huge drawcard for locals plus international sports ev



**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 to develop Auckland for future growth. We are growing and we need better public spaces to be continually regenerating for our growing city.

A public saltwater pool (with clean water) would be a huge drawcard for locals plus international sports events like Water Polo, Triathalons, Swimming. It has to be wide and long enough plus 2m deep on both ends. If you go ahead with this don't mess it up by making it too small and too shallow. You could even lease out spaces around the facility to sporting organisations like New Zealand Water Polo, Triathlon, NZ swimming, Auckland Water Polo. We could attract and host international events here with that pool over the summer months- generate tourist revenue and eyeballs with worldwide TV coverage

**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</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#920



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.	Other
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.	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.	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?**

Franklin



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

#### 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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important



#920



Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Getting the roads maintained and upgraded has to be the priority. There is no public transport options for the masses. The roads are a mess, Beachlands Mareatai road upgrade has been talked about for 20 years. It needs to happen now as the priority.  
Nothi

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

Getting the roads maintained and upgraded has to be the priority. There is no public transport options for the masses. The roads are a mess, Beachlands Mareatai road upgrade has been talked about for 20 years. It needs to happen now as the priority. Nothing else is that important than getting our basic services operating to an acceptable and safe standard.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Getting the roads maintained and upgraded has to be the priority. There is no public transport options for the masses. The roads are a mess, Beachlands Mareatai road upgrade has been talked about for 20 years. It needs to happen now as the priority.  
Nothi

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

Clevedon



**#920**



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: Franklin

## 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	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?

less festivals and functions in the CBD. Not easy to get to



**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 so trains are reliable

**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 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?**

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



#938



<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 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>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?**

Franklin, Papakura

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

**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
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	Not Important



#938



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not 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?**

**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**

Ararimu

**Papakura Local Board Priorities**

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



I do not support most priorities

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

<p>We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Papakura 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: Franklin

## 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?

Actually do your core role. I don't have water, rubbish collection or any discernable road front maintenance, yet I pay over \$3K per year....and your solution to things is to charge me more?

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



Everything in that does not lead to better outcomes for normal people. I don't want more cycle ways for 0.5% of the population. I want better roads for 80% of the population

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

axe the ridiculous raised pedestrians and cycleways.

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

getting rid of the ridiculous raised pedestrians 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

**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?**

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	Do not support
---	----------------



#946



<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>	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>	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>	Do not support
<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



#946



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
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	Not Important



#946



board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Pukekohe East



**#946**



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: Franklin

## 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:**



**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>	



#968



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1002**



**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:**



#1002



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>	



#1002



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: Franklin

## 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?

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



**#1110**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

network optimisation and stopping raised pedestrian crossings is good. But public transport is just a giant hole for rate payer money and will take at least a generation to see an improvement

**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:**

Because any change will cost more than budgeted and any forecast returns will not be achieved.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#1110



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



#1110



<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>
<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>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>



#1110



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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place	Not Important



#1110



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Pukekohe East

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?



**#1161**



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?**



#1161



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>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>



#1161



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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.	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.	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.	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?**



#1161



## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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
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).	Fairly Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly Important



#1161



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.	I don't know
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.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?

CHECK ALL TENDERS MORE CAREFULLY CUT ALL CITY BURBS

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

NO MORE CYCLE WAYS



**#1201**



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

EMPLOY PEOPLE THAT KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING

**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?**

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:**



#1201



**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



#1201



<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>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>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>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>



#1201



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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place	Not Important



#1201



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not 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**

THESE PROJECTS ARE NOT VITAL, A SUPERMARKET AT CLARKS BEACH IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN ALL THAT RUBBISH ABOVE

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

NO ONE IN FRANKLIN CARES ONE BIT,

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

Clarks Beach



**#1201**



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

ASK THE PEOPLE WHAT THEY REALLY WANT, RATHER THAN TELLING AS WHAT WE NEED.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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 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?

Capex

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



**#1205**



Opex

**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:**



#1205



**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



#1205



<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>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>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>



#1205



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, Papakura

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place	Not Important



#1205



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Pukekohe

**Papakura Local Board Priorities**

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



#1205



I support most priorities

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

<p>We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Papakura 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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Nothing

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



**#1209**



Freeze all spending and leave rates as they are. Once you get our money you can then start looking at what can be spent and prioritise with what you have. Just like how we the rate payers have to operate.

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

Don't support any of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Need an independent review on the current waste. Safety cameras, speed humps, ridiculous layout of roads, speed humps and roundabouts. Common sense needs to come back from morons with qualifications and no life experiences.

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

Absolutely not. Freeze everything!

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

Rainbow \*\*\*\*\* that is jammed down our throats. Speed bumps and overall control. Council should spend on core services only. No feel good rubbish!

## **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:**

Most of our community grounds are under-utilised. We spend too much maintaining this infrastructure.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



**#1209**



**Tell us why:**

Council make stupid decisions that no one is held accountable for with no consequences using our money that most think is a right of passage so would need to do more research before answering.

**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 are irresponsible with money they don't have! If you were a business you would be in receivership.

**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:**

Fund core 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?**

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

**Tell us why:**



#1209



More dreams to spend money you don't have.

**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>
<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>



#1209



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.	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.	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?**

Freeze all spending and only fund core services until you sort your finances. Only spend what you have and stop bleeding the rate payers for poor decisions and wasteful spending. I'd like a www site in English that asks the rate payers what to spend your current income on. There would be a lot of waste cuts.

**Local board priorities**

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

Franklin



#1209



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

#### 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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important



#1209



Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Freeze all spending until you have the funds to do things.

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

As above. Freeze everything and review with your current income for rates.

**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**

Pukekohe

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

This is a pipe dream and I'm sure no one will even look at what I have to say. Councils around the country have been wasting ratepayers money for years spending on stupid pet projects. Enough is enough, we need accountability in every dollar spent.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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>	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?

Actual baseline improvements of services for public transport that improve the efficiency and availability with less spent on making things look nice. More money on effective management of projects and making sure deadlines are met. More frequent connections in franklin area from towns like waiuku, clarks beach, kingseat etc to major transportation hubs



#1253



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

Developing inner city projects that a lot of people dont use. Take inspo from places like queenstown for city design that is effective and welcoming. Get rid of old buildings if need be but focus on connecting all of auckland rather than the main city centre cause main city is ugly

**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?**

Connections across auckland and frequency of connections. Make motorways more efficient.

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

Making things look nice rather than being functional. As long as its functional then it should be fine

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

Other

**Tell us why:**

Never been there. Dont think is too important. But reallocate maintenance to redesign or improve sounds 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)?**



**#1253**



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:**

**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?**



#1253



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 programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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).	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



#1253



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.	Support
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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through	Very Important
---	----------------



#1253



<p>projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, 'Belmont' Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	Fairly Important
<p>Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).</p>	Very Important
<p>Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.</p>	Fairly Important
<p>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.</p>	Fairly Important
<p>Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.</p>	Very Important
<p>Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.</p>	Fairly Important
<p>Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.</p>	I don't know

**Tell us why**



**#1253**



More walks and connections would be good for franklin. Also any initiatives to bring down house pricing across the board is recommended.

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

**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**

Clarks Beach

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

Please better connect franklin areas and allow more streamlined public transport. So many current routes would only need slight adjustments to widen access of public transport with more communities



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?

No

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

Wastage and non core work



**#1258**



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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Just get auckland traffic moving. Scrap the reduced limits, bus lanes and cycle ways.

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

Potholes

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

Cycle and buslanes, and raised pedestrian crossings

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Use it more efficiently to generate income

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**



**#1258**



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:**

It could be a huge tourist attraction. Look at what they did in CapeTown, South Africa

**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 could be a huge tourist attraction. Look at what they did in CapeTown, South Africa



#1258



**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>
<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>I don't know</p>



#1258



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Fairly Important



#1258



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

Fix the roads

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#1258**



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

Ararimu

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1261**



**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:**



#1261



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>	



#1261



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



#1268



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

safety improvements and cycleway initiatives are important steps in looking after our most vulnerable and reducing the load on our transport network. These things should be continued, but possibly in a different form.

**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:**

Once the public loses ownership of the land it will never be gained back. It is critical that our public land is maintained. Further exploration and thinking about changing the operational management including opening it up for more types of commercial activities or leasing and events should be explored. In particular ticketed events that the community value will help to cover costs.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

sale of shares is a short sighted solution that will lead to greater problems down the line. The responsibility should be put back to central government with the removal of things like the regional fuel tax exacerbating the funding pressures for the region. I



#1268



would like to see a better approach that doesn't limit our longterm investments. In particular a CBD zoned toll would be good, something as simple as \$1 a day per vehicle which goes back to getting people on to public transport or mitigating fare prices.

**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 conclusions presented are too short-sighted. What is the evidence or possible return looking at 15-20 years into the future? and how does that balance with the rates changes. In order to consider selling the land Auckland Council needs to look 50 years into the future and not at the next 3 years of 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:**

This would balance the increase in rates that you have suggested. It would be also good to look at what other revenue streams for the future fund are available. I.e. could targeted rates work to collect money towards the fund, where the money has to sit in the fund for 6-10 years before it can be used. This would allow the fund to grow and be focused on the future rather than annual extreme weather events or other similar things.

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

**Tell us here:**

Auckland Council MUST think in the long term, beyond 10 years. Looking at the problems and solutions, what would be the best scenario in 50-100 years, and how would each of the decision/solutions lead us towards that scenario. It makes little



#1268



sense to sell an asset that provides financial returns when you consider the returns over the next 100 years compared to the immediate future.

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

Other

**Tell us why:**

What is the expected ROI of the land being transferred to Auckland Council. How much profit does the cloud generate, and would having two more of these generate the same amount of money or more? If it becomes open public space, then no money would be gene

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

clearer evidence needs to be provided about the potential benefits. The risk that port operations would significantly decrease and materials be trucked/railed into the region is a poor outcome. We should draw from the evidence and reports already written about the proposal to get rid of the ports to understand the risks.

**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



#1268



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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.	Support
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



#1268



6b. Do you have 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,Papakura

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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
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.	Very 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



#1268



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Very 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?**

good

**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**

Ramarama

**Papakura Local Board Priorities**

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



#1268



I support all priorities

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

<p>We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>

**Tell us why**

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

great!



**#1268**



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: Franklin

## 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	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?



**#1300**



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)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I have always been strongly opposed to selling the Airport shares. (Manukau City was I think, the last lot of shares that became Auckland's, and were a gift in the first place, and a valued source of income

**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:**



#1300



Maybe leasing the Port to private enterprise would see better management (and financial return) than has been seen up to now.

**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

I don't know



#1300



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).	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.	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.	I don't know
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



#1300



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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



#1300



Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Waiau Pa



**#1300**



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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1306**



**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 . Express services Pukekohe to puhinui , Newmarket and cbd. More cycleways . Improved public transport options for schools

**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:**

Not convinced longer term alternative earnings would be more than airport shares.  
Good for airport to have some public ownership

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

Other



#1306



Tell us here:

Get rid of the port from current location and re develop 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?**

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

Support



#1306



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.	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.	Support
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support



#1306



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
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	Fairly Important



#1306



board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very 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.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Support it



**#1306**



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

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1328**



**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:**



#1328



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>	



#1328



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.	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: Franklin

## 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 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?

The council should only be involved in core services not nice to have concerts, festivals etc



**#1332**



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

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

My main concern is that we've had these extra taxes for some time now and the transport services in Auckland are significantly worse.

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

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

Anything that retards the efficient movement of traffic.

**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:**

I would need more information to decided one way or the other.

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



#1332



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?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in	Do not support
---	----------------



#1332



<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>	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>	Do not support
<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



#1332



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
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	Not Important



#1332



board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	I don't know
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

I think the area has far more pressing concerns than these.

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

I couldn't find this information on your page.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#1332**



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

Paerata

**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: Franklin

## 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 more
<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?

Get rid of the bus lanes and make them available to cars. Do an honest survey on how many people travel by public transport and how many travel via cars and utilize the road space according to the usage. I see empty buses everywhere and cars jammed up in the roads. The designated cycle ways and bus lanes are a joke. Use all the roading available for the vast majority of traffic i.e. cars.



**#1333**



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

Spend less on public transport and cycle ways.

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The roads are being damaged by heavy trucks so there need to be a special road user tax for heavy trucks. Perhaps this could be added to their annual license fee and the government could pass that onto the regions to help fix the roads.

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

We will need an extra crossing across the harbour at some point and I like the idea of a congestion tax.

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

Less on public transport.

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

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

We need to use it for more 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



**#1333**



**Tell us why:**

We need to balance investments with the cost of new infrastructure.

**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 would like to sell Eden Park so it could be used for future housing and build a multi purpose stadium on some city land, perhaps parts of Auckland land which will bring the life back into the city and where there are both eating places and parking buildings. Also all public transport can be used to transport people to the central city.

**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 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.



#1333



**Tell us why:**

We need a multi use stadium in the city which can encourage people to travel, stay and eat in the central city and watch sport events and live shows.

**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 harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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.	Do not support



#1333



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.	Support
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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities



#1333



**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.	Fairly Important
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important



#1333



Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Most of Franklin is rural. Please keep it that way.

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

Keep Franklin rural as much as possible.

**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**

Glenbrook

**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: Franklin

## 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	
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?

I think libraries, pools and parks- including beach reserves are really important to all the city. I do not give a toss about the CBD - I live rurally. I do NOT want the airport shares sold or the Port to be long term leased - you are killing the goose that lays the golden eggs - these are NOT your assets to sell



**#1356**



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

Maybe fewer parades and arty things - if we are expected top pay. For public transport. We should be paying for the other. Nice to haves.

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I am very aware we need to reduce congestion - the best way to do this is to have a first class. Public transport system - this includes waking and biking options, as well as bus lanes, trains and ferries. Not bigger roads- that is looking back -0 we need to be greener very quickly

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

yes - bus lanes, trains and cycle ways - safe ones. I would also get electric scooters OFF footpaths and cycleways

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

Roads

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I live. Very much in South east Auckland - I would never go to the North shore 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)?**



#1356



Other

**Tell us why:**

Yes the AFF is a good idea - but should NOT be funded by selling assets - do what sensible families do - start putting a little bit in each week - cut all the tp salaries in the council. By. \$1,000.00 - even better pay them what teachers or nurses get - they are not. Worth more than a nurse or a teacher - pout the extra \$\$\$ into the 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:**

As I said before you are killing the goose that lays the golden eggs and lining the pockets of the wealthy

**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 for both council services and to fund the 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?**



#1356



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:**

Wynyard. Quarter is lovely - we could do with a bigger area

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I do not know enough to comment

**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>I don't know</p>



#1356



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.	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.	Support
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?**

Franklin



#1356



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

#### 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.	Fairly Important
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Very Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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



#1356



Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

The paths project might get as far as Kawakawa Bay - where I live - not much elks has any impact - apart form the libraries

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

What happens will happen

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

would like to see cycle way. From papakura to Kaiua - our roads are very dangerous to cyclist

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

Kawakawa Bay

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

None - except questionnaire was easy to answer - well done



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?



**#1363**



**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:**



#1363



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>	



#1363



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1366**



**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:**



#1366



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>	



#1366



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?

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

No spending on cultural events, gay events, professional sports activities or promotions, yacht racing, promotions for Auckland and NO stadiums



**#1367**



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

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We don't need raised pedestrian crossings or cycle ways

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

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

Auckland transport authority

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Stadium is for professional use, let them pay

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

Because if there is money politicians will spend it on self promoting projects

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



**#1367**



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 holder will not spend money on improvements so if you lease it then in 35 years it will be so run down it's worth nothing

**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?**



#1367



<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 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>



#1367



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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

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.	Not Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Not Important



#1367



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

Not much

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#1367**



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

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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?

na

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

na



**#1380**



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

na

**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)?**

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:**



#1380



**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



#1380



<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>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>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>



#1380



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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place	Not Important



#1380



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

other cities regard the development of paths / walkways as a way to make the communities more attractive to visitors and hence more money into local businesses.

The development of paths walk ways should be solely funded by council using local business rat

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

Beachlands



**#1380**



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: Franklin

## 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	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, walking and cycling options. Particularly in East Auckland.

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



**#1382**



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Very disappointed with stopping raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways. These are very important for our rangatahi.

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

More on walking, cycling and public transport.

**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)?**

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



**#1382**



**Tell us here:**

Strongly support the facility being leased out. Although I wish that we had a national ports operator that would enter that 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:**

**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'm in favour of whichever option will remove ferry operations from being affected by cruise ships. Its a shambles at the moment, negatively affecting our already not-great public transport infrastructure

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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



#1382



<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>Support</p>



#1382



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Fairly Important



#1382



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very 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?**

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#1382**



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

Maraetai

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?



**#1390**



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)?**

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?**

I don't know



#1390



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.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value	



#1390



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.	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?**



#1390



## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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
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).	Fairly Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly Important



#1390



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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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?**

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

I can't see the detail about what the paths will look like. We're being asked to pay \$520 in total for something that has no outline or project plan. What if costs go up? Will we be asked to pay more? Or will be refunded if nothing happens? There isn

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

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1421**



**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:**



#1421



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>	



#1421



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1444**



**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:**



#1444



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>	



#1444



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?

Stop the use of cones. You are just wasting our money. I am tired of seeing all these people driving trucks around to control traffic. It has become an uncontrolled industry.



**#1477**



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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Going into the city should be user pays. No more stupid raised pedestrian crossings.

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

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

Cone people.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Great stadium needs to be used. Nightmare to get to though when had big games.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 to use the money for greater good.

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



**#1477**



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 control not working very well.

**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:**

Can't justify more expenditure

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Need a port for Auckland



#1477



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 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>Support</p>



#1477



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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.	
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	



#1477



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Great idea. Local foot paths are desperately needed.



**#1477**



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

Kawakawa Bay

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?



**#1538**



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)?**

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?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#1538



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 harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	Support



#1538



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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.	Support
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?**



#1538



## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know



#1538



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.	I don't know
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Compared to other regions of Auckland we have NO paths! Something has to change!

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

Patumahoe

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Actually fix things that are broken not things that aren't. Fixing pot hole road are more important than redoing the same patch for the 5th time in 6months and it looks the same

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



**#1539**



Food scraps

**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?**

Transport actually going to places not currently routes

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

Cycle ways

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Seems 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)?**

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

**Tell us why:**

Can still make us money



**#1539**



**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?**

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?**



#1539



<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>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>Do not support</p>



#1539



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.	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?**

Franklin,Papakura

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

**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
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Fairly Important



#1539



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know
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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

Lots of things, no money

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



#1539



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

Ramarama

## Papakura Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.	Fairly Important
We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.	Not Important
We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.	Not Important
We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.	Fairly Important
Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to	Not Important



**#1539**



showcase this through the community arts programme.

**Tell us why**

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

Huge Maori focus but what about everyone else

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1544**



**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:**



#1544



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>	



#1544



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1552**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

Increasing rapid transport between waiuku and rail transport network.... Currently it's 3 times as long and the same cost to get from Waiuku to the CBD

**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:**

From Waiuku not 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)?**

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

**Tell us here:**



#1552



**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	Support



#1552



<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>	Other
<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>	Support
<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



#1552



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important



#1552



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very 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.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Use of fruit bearing trees in park areas instead of lawns would be greater benefit to local community in which cost pressures are increasing

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

**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**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1555**



**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:**



#1555



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>	



#1555



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1562**



**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:**



#1562



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>	



#1562



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1564**



**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:**



#1564



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>	



#1564



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1571**



**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:**



#1571



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>	



#1571



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1581**



**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:**



#1581



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>	



#1581



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.	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: Franklin

## 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	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?

Push AT to lift speed limits and properly repair our roads

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

Less focus on pleasing minorities and focus on pleasing the majority



**#1601**



**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?**

More investment in our roading infrastructure

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

Public transport that's not utilised

**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:**

**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



#1601



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



#1601



<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>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>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>



#1601



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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Not Important
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	Not Important



#1601



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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?**

Invest in local roading, funding community patrols

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

I would rather put the money towards fixing our roads

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

Waiuku



**#1601**



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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1606**



**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:**



#1606



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>	



#1606



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1610**



**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:**



#1610



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>	



#1610



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: Franklin

## 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	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?

Less spending on needless AT projects. Raised pedestrian crossings on main roads hold up traffic. Put them outside schools but not at every pedestrian crossing. And



#1656



definitely do not build raised table intersections like the one on Manuroa Road in Takanini.

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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

AT has been allowed to slow Auckland traffic down without support from Auckland Rate Payers.

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

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

Raised Table intersections and pedestrian crossings

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

There appears to be a lot of vacant un-used land that could be developed.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**



**#1656**



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 feel we could lose the ability to alter the ports if we lease the land out.

**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?**



#1656



<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>
<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>Support</p>



#1656



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Very Important



#1656



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#1656**



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

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?



**#1667**



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:**



#1667



**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



#1667



<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>	Support
<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



#1667



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important



#1667



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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very 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?**

**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**

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1680**



**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:**



#1680



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>	



#1680



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?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?

no

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



#1733



no

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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

safety

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

more access to green spaces and waterways

**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 an amazing stadium but access to and from can be 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)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

more funds for local development

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



**#1733**



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:**

never sell the chattels - gains made from leasing

**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:**

makes sense

**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:**

common sense

**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



#1733



**Tell us why:**

the heart of auckland

**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>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>



#1733



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	Support
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.	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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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	Very Important
---	----------------



#1733



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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.	Very 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Give children a place to play and ride bikes on paths NOT Roads this should be a number one priority



**#1733**



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

acceptable

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

a fantastic idea - keeping our children safe is a number one priority and would love to see more of these trails being implemented

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

Clevedon

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1748**



**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:**



#1748



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>	



#1748



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: Franklin

## 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	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?



**#1786**



**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:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**



#1786



**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 <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



#1786



<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>	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>	Support
<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



#1786



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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
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.	Very 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



#1786



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Bombay

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Get better infrastructure efficiency (pay to get ut,, then shld cost less!) - too many staff doing political rubbish. Let the elected politicians be political - all others - get the work done with sensible project leadership

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



**#1793**



Lighten up the political marketing department - under whatever, and various names it runs

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Akl City should campaign much harder to get proper proportions of current tax take from current activities, eg GST, Motor Reg, Road User, including general income tax

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

Are there enough road cones yet?!?!?

That just seems crazy!

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

Road cones!

**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:**

Get 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)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#1793**



seems best

**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:**

retain the asset - get capable operators

**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:**

sort operations properly everywhere, and invest in the future

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

**Tell us here:**

nothing further unless quite detailed

**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:**

streamline



#1793



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

port terminals for port activities

**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>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the 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>	



#1793



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?**

too much messing with environment - let it be, except for fixing up the results of human interference in the past

**Local board priorities**

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

Franklin

**Franklin Local Board Priorities**

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

I support most priorities



#1793



**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.	Fairly Important
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Not 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



**#1793**



**Tell us why**

This can all be tricky - in the past dome Council id unhelpful, some nonsense, some very expensive

wherever possible, assist the local community ti sort its own way forward. Andy Baker is a very good thinker, and has savvy with sterring things in good d

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

ok

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

less is better

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

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1801**



**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:**



#1801



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>	



#1801



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: Franklin

## 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?

No

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

Less self promotion more user pays on public services



**#1804**



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

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Make all public transport user pays.

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

No

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

All of the above

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

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Sell the land and reduce cost to rate payers. One stadium in Auckland is 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)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Rate payers don't pay rates to buy and hold shares sell them and reduce rates.

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



**#1804**



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:**

Best option to reduce cost on rate payers

**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:**

Lease separately for increased income.

**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:**



#1804



Lease separately for increased income.

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.	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	Do not support



#1804



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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#1804



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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Drive efficiency to reduce costs and minimise services to needs, not nice to haves.

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



**#1804**



As above focus on driving efficiency in services to reduce costs and minimise all services to needs, not nice to haves. Councils need to get back to the basics.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Plenty of paths already, surely rates can be better spent elsewhere. Paths should be installed by developers when building subdivisions.

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

Clarks Beach

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1805**



**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:**



#1805



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>	



#1805



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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1816**



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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Hopefully an effective way forward

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

Safe walkways/cycles to encourage people to not drive unnecessarily.. works for all age groups

**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 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



#1816



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

Support



#1816



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.	Support
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



#1816



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

**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

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

Very Important



#1816



board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Other projects more important in my opinion

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

Excellent, hope all can be achieved

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#1816**



Safe access for all age groups as traffic volume increases

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

Clevedon

**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): Stevenson Aggregates Limited

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?



**#1821**



**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:**



#1821



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>	



#1821



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1843**



**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:**



#1843



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>	



#1843



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.	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): Cycle Coach Janet Stqk

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?



**#1906**



**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:**



#1906



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>	



#1906



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1907**



**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:**



#1907



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>	



#1907



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1909**



**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:**



#1909



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>	



#1909



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.	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: Franklin

## 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 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?

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



**#1912**



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?**



#1912



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 programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount	Do not support



#1912



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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.	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.	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?**



#1912



## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly Important



#1912



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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very 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?**

**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**

Beachlands

**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: Franklin

## 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>	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?



**#1913**



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?**



#1913



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>



#1913



<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>	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>	Support
<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



#1913



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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



#1913



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Beachlands

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

- a. We support the increased \$35m of investment into the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund



**#1913**



- b. We 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
- d. We 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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1961**



**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:**



#1961



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>	



#1961



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1968**



**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:**



#1968



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>	



#1968



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1971**



**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:**



#1971



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>	



#1971



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1982**



**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:**



#1982



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>	



#1982



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#1990**



**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:**



#1990



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>	



#1990



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2004**



**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:**



#2004



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>	



#2004



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.	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: Franklin

## 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 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?

I would like to see AT reigned in of excessive expenditure with no results. For example buses have been travelling to and from Pukekohe Railway Station now for approx 8 years. Almost all have no one in them or 1 or 2 whether it is arriving or leaving. They



**#2009**



come from as far away as Waiuku. I have watched the buses from our office in Queen St and at the Station. Surely the public have had long enough to use. The service should be cancelled forthwith. Even the mooted service to call for a ride is unnecessary. Taxi, Uber or walk or drive to the Station

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

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

A large amount of monbey has already been spent on projects with no improvement in the end result. Plan just continues on with some change but will not achieve the result planned or needed.

**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:**



**#2009**



It is a short term knee reaction. The Port has made large strides under new management to improve safety, turnaround, and efficiency. The sale of an operating licence would bring in cash but the Lessee would simply increase costs of using the Port which will result in increased costs to Ratepayers and Consumers. It is essential it is kept under good management. The return from the fund after lucrative Management Rights will provide no more than keeping the Port. With the diluted investment in Auckland Airport I do not think the same as the Port but would prefer to keep what is left

**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:**

As above

**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 Auckland Fund is not worth having

**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



#2009



**Tell us why:**

The Port needs to be able to service as many ships as possible with the result of the least amount of Road Transport. Already Tauranga is restricted and Shipping Companies making various comments about delays. Road Transport is also a major polluter.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Same 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>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>



#2009



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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.	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.	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?

Franklin



#2009



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

#### 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
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important



#2009



Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Gone ovedrboard

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

Mauku

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2031**



**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:**



#2031



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>	



#2031



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2033**



**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:**



#2033



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>	



#2033



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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2037**



**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:**



#2037



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>	



#2037



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2039**



**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:**



#2039



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>	



#2039



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2071**



**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:**



#2071



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>	



#2071



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.	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: Franklin

## 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 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?

The focus is always on the city centre and transport is unreliable. It’s also not easy for everyone to travel in and out of city centre.

I think we did better when we were 5 cities and funded our selves.



**#2101**



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

Sell some golf courses

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

National are making the costs of living more difficult, removing benefits etc and people's incomes don't rise. We have to consider how hard it is for people to manage when everything is being increased.

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

I have a limited income I might spend more if transport was reliable

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

Petrol. Events. Shows when tickets are now \$100 on average

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Traffic congestion.

Limited accessibility

Parking

Transport options



**#2101**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 benefit and it's good to have some say in its running.

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

Other

**Tell us here:**

Move it to northland where it will bring employment and also make the city more open and attractive.

**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:**

Not my first option.

**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.



#2101



**Tell us why:**

Makes sense

**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:**

More useful

**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>



#2101



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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.	Support
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?

Franklin,Papakura



#2101



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

#### 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.	Fairly Important
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.	Very 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important



#2101



Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

A balanced approach

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

Building community, creating housing, protecting arable land, market gardens, agriculture and farming. These are what make Franklin a great place to live. Not overcrowded like Papakura, Manurewa and manukau. With too much infill housing, no parking effective and limited transport. Why did you ever get rid of the buses!!!!

Bus and train service is needed, not empty buses driving in circles to stations.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Keep Franklin beautiful. I love the trees in streets and the native planting around roads and watercare areas. People are friendly. However There are too many dogs left howling and barking all day.

Waiuku needs a police station and police on the beat, the

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

Pukekohe East

**Papakura Local Board Priorities**

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

I support most priorities



#2101



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

We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.	Very Important
We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.	Very Important
We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.	Very Important
We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.	Fairly Important
Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

They all add value

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

I know it's hard to please everyone and money is a problem but do your best to create a community you would want to live and thrive in yourselves.

Thank you for your good work on behalf of us all.



**#2101**



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

Be good when pukekohe has a service and station again.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?



**#2103**



**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:**



#2103



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>	



#2103



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: Franklin

## 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>	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 our rates are unaffordable for many as it is.

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



**#2130**



Stop putting in crossings so close to roundabouts, these are dangerous for motorists and pedestrians. Need to be moved back.

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stop the ridiculous raised crossings close to roundabouts.

**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?**

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?**



**#2130**



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?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Enhance Harbour 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:**

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



#2130



<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>
<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>



#2130



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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Fairly Important



#2130



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Not 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.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Pay enough rates. Our rates should and used to cover this anyway.



**#2130**



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

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2145**



**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:**



#2145



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>	



#2145



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?

Better transport, roads, infrastructure. Do the basics well

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



**#2179**



Waste money on greenwashing marketing and consultants, cycleways that no one uses, speed bumps which cost \$500K each. We want value for money and do the basics well.

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

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Cost effective measures to reduce peak congestion would be welcome. Also need to finish the projects already started on time and on budget

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

Roading- Our current roads in Auckland are a disgrace, and embarrassing when we have international visitors

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

We spend too much and waste too much time on road safety which increases costs and time to finish projects. The cost to productivity of slowing everyone down trying to get to work is ridiculous and this does not seem to be taken into account by the council

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

The stadium needs to deliver value through its financial sustainability or other intangible benefits to the community. Currently it is not doing this so need to change things so that it does.

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



**#2179**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The council does not need to be a shareholder in this business. Especially as it is not delivering a sufficient ROI for ratepayers. Sell the shares and invest in other infrastructure or pay off 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:**

The council does not need to be a shareholder in this business. Especially as it is not delivering a sufficient ROI for ratepayers. Sell the shares and invest in other infrastructure or pay off debt

**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 profits and dividends should be used to provide ratepayers cheaper 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?**

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



#2179



**Tell us why:**

We have bigger things to worry about right now. Invest councils resources in doing their core services well, not becoming property developers.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

We have bigger things to worry about right now. Invest councils resources in doing their core services well, not becoming property developers.

**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>



#2179



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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.	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.	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?

Franklin



#2179



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

#### 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.	
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important



#2179



Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Focus on doing the core services (Rubish, roads, sewerage and water), not getting sidetracked on projects that should be run by other community organisations. It is not the councils responsibility

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

Have not read

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

New paths for new subdivisions should be funded by the property developers, not council. Not sure what is wrong with the existing paths?

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

Paerata

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Ensure more cycleways physically separated from roads (can be by bollards as I saw on parts of Lambie Drive the other day). To just have painted lines on the road to separate cars from bicycles is not safe enough for cyclists.

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



**#2192**



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I'm not sure that raised pedestrian crossings are worth their cost. There also seem to be so many being put in close to other crossings. Some of that money could be put into bollards or some other physical barrier to separate roadway from cycleway.

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

Safe cycleways. This would encourage people to get out of cars and onto bicycles.

Focus on better public transport. Vehicle drivers will benefit if there are fewer vehicles on the roads.

**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:**

Not my part of town. I don't understand the background behind the perceived problem.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**



#2192



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 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	



#2192



<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>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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>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>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 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>	



#2192



6b. Do you have 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

## 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.	I don't know
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).	I don't know



#2192



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know
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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

I am reluctant to make comment because I am woefully ignorant about many of the priorities.

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

Couldn't find page 113. Saw some possible priorities on p584 of Supporting Document for LongTerm Plan 2024-2034. I'm happy with the 8 listed priorities (2 groups of 4).

**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**

Clevedon



**#2192**



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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2196**



**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:**



#2196



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>	



#2196



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2205**



**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:**



#2205



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>	



#2205



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2209**



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 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:**



#2209



**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



#2209



<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>	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>	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>	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



**#2209**



**6b. Do you have 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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2211**



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:**



#2211



**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



#2211



<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>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 around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#2211



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important



#2211



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Bombay

**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: Franklin

## 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 less
Environment and regulation	Do more
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?

Developing roads and infrastructure in areas with large growth. I.E - Franklin

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



**#2222**



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Need to Put secondary options to the Southern Motorway.

**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:**

Not a requirement. Nothing good happens there anyway

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#2222



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 increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#2222



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>	
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.	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.	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



#2222



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important



#2222



Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2243**



**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:**



#2243



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>	



#2243



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2261**



**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:**



#2261



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>	



#2261



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.	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: Franklin

## 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 raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways



**#2272**



**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 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:**



#2272



**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



#2272



<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>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>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>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>



#2272



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important



#2272



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not 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?**

**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**

**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: Franklin

## 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	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
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?



#2296



As above, you cant keep increasing rates as people are struggling to pay their rates, it has to stop increasing, maybe us more private company funds for roading and use tolls to pay for the roads like they did with the auckland bridge then once it paid to toll is taken away

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

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

if you want people to use public transport it has to be efficient and reliable

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

tourism, they bring money in

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

cultural and free events

## 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 things to spend money on and keep rates low so that people can afford to actually live in Auckland

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



**#2296**



**Tell us why:**

it gives money needed and should keep rates down

**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:**

its a great asset

**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:**

its the right thing to do for everyone

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



#2296



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>
<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>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>



#2296



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths 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.	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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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	Very Important
---	----------------



#2296



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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



**#2296**



**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**

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2311**



**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:**



#2311



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>	



#2311



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2337**



**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:**



#2337



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>	



#2337



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2340**



**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:**



#2340



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>	



#2340



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2341**



**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:**



#2341



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>	



#2341



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2345**



**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:**



#2345



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>	



#2345



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2372**



**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:**



#2372



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>	



#2372



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2373**



**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:**



#2373



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>	



#2373



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2377**



**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:**



#2377



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>	



#2377



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2379**



**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:**



#2379



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>	



#2379



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2385**



**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:**



#2385



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>	



#2385



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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2389**



**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:**



#2389



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>	



#2389



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2409**



**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:**



#2409



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>	



#2409



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.	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: Franklin

## 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 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?

equal access to services for all rate payers even in rural communities

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

improved road maintenance so it doesn't get repeated



**#2524**



**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?**

improve pine harbour ferry service including going to Waiheke and having bus feeder from ferry

**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 a priority for me

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**



**#2524**



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?**



#2524



<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>	Do not support
<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>	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>	Do not support



#2524



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?**

do not increase rates

**Local board priorities**

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

Franklin

**Franklin Local Board Priorities**

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

I support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#2524



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 Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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



**#2524**



**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**

Beachlands

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Transport to areas other than central

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

Beautification of the central city



**#2544**



**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?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Doesn't benefit everyone

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**



#2544



**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:**

Doesn't benefit everyone

**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



#2544



<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>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>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>



#2544



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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

**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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place	Not Important



#2544



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?

No do less.

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



**#2555**



The Council should do less of cultural and other event services. These are a waste of money and should fundraise for themselves privately.

Also stop spending money because it is in the budget, if it is not needed don't spend it on stupid things like this crossing here or a cycle lane here. This is just pathetic, known, and yet still happens.

In saying this. There is actually no point in you asking us what you want to thou, as you have already decided to increase rates.

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

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Because this won't solve the problem. Invest in decentralization if business hubs out of the major centre's so offices don't need to be in the city. Simple math here, less people needing to go into the city means less traffic.

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

Zips for your pockets so they are not so easy to reach into, it's our money in there so think before spending.

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

Cultural and community events. Non-essential items like playgrounds etc.

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

Other

### **Tell us why:**

Get rid of it and sell. It's a waste of money.



**#2555**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

You have decided to do this so why does my view matter.

**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:**



#2555



**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 city centre at current state is a rubbish pit. It needs something to be done but the council can't be trusted to do the right thing so it should be with someone 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 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



#2555



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.	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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Enhance efficiency and foster transparency, which is currently. It's not just about monitoring expenses; we need to understand and plan for the reasons behind overspending and excessive overheads.

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



**#2556**



Spending more by increasing rates is not the only solution. So please god sake think about how we can reduce people burden by giving effective service rather than throwing money on everything without thinking.

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

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Just focus on motarway and new modern electric tram bus(works on normal roads) and should not take more than 40 minutes to AUCKLAND city from anywhere.

For ex Pukekohe to Auckland CBD

o Whepuanai to Auckland CBD

or Silverdale/Orewa to Auckland CBD

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

Motarway and New electric AI based tram running on top of motorway & connected with normal roads for quicked time.

### **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



#2556



**Tell us why:**

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

Other

**Tell us here:**

Sell port and invest in basic Auckland issue (road network and quick connectivity).  
Because if we did this then people start moving out and business also spread out.

ELse Auckland wont be a good place to live in next 50 years surely.

**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



#2556



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>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>Support</p>



#2556



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	Support
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?

Franklin,Papakura

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

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
--	----------------



#2556



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not 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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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



#2556



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

Paerata

## Papakura Local Board Priorities

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

I don't know

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

We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.	Not Important
We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.	Not Important
We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.	Fairly Important
We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.	Not Important
Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to	Not Important



**#2556**



showcase this through the community arts programme.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Papakura 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: Franklin

## 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 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?

No. Wages are not increasing at the rate expenditures are going and this is leading to debt for most first home buyers.

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



**#2585**



Reduce expenditure on unnecessary road works. Plan for future in advance. Multiple projects in the past 15yrs have seen changes concerning roads and infrastructure development which add significant costs to the project. If u need 2 lanes make 3/4 in advance so you don't spend more in expansion again in 2/3yrs.

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

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Not a lot of cycle user, not a lot of users for public transportation due to lack of speed of travel. EV users being asked for RUC but they already helping by reducing fossil fuel usage and reducing carbon emissions. Why punish EV users by adding RUC at such a high rate. They paying for electricity usage already. It is taxed already.

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

Making sure roads are of good quality

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

Making sure users follow instructions and road rules

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

Ask for the region residents to fund it rather than the whole of the city/ country. Tax them to get fund.

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



**#2585**



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?**



#2585



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 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#2585



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.	Support
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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through	Fairly Important
---	------------------



#2585



<p>projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, ‘Belmont’ Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
<p>Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>

**Tell us why**



**#2585**



Belmont park in sub division is not important. It is going to cause problems for residents living near it.

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

**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**

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: Franklin

## 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 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?



**#2591**



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

support raised pedestrian crossings

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

more w&c 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)?**

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



#2591



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 <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	Support
---	---------



#2591



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.	Support
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



#2591



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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
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.	Very Important



#2591



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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

transport

**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**

Paerata



**#2591**



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: Franklin

## 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 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?

AC needs to focus on key services. They also need to protect areas that is council land such sea walls,. Homes owners are not able to obtain insurance cover for repair and damage caused by storm water that has had a secondary impact on sea walls

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



**#2613**



Programs such as arts festivals need to be joint ventures with private partnerships rather than rate payer funded.

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

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

AC needs to focus on what is within their scope rather than what is the Central Govt scope. We do need a gold standard transport network rather a functional economic network

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

Main hiways, such as Linwood Rd Karkaka. There is massive housing proposed for this area and yet there is no increase in road. The answer form AT is the train service. This does not take into account getting to the proposed train station, either Papakura or Paratea. The congestion in this area along with the destruction of food growing land is criminal. AC continues to allow large housing projects with no infrastructure.

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

Review all spend. We seem to want gold standards with no accountability

## **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



**#2613**



**Tell us why:**

With caution. We do not want to another bureaucratic area with layers of cost to the ratepayer.

**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:**

THIS makes sense, other wise its always the ratepayer who will fund AC.

**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:**



#2613



**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 harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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	Support



#2613



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.	Support
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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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



#2613



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.	Fairly Important
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very 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.	Not Important



**#2613**



**Tell us why**

Some of the above are nice to do rather than need to do.

I see nothing in here regarding protecting the sea wall in Clarks Beach and Auckland accepting this is their responsibility. I see nothing in here regarding the Clarks Beach to Waiiau Beach Coastal W

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

Much is missing. There seems to be a focus on Pukekohe rather than on the rural sector which is quickly turning into Urban development.

**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**

Clarks Beach

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

As mentioned previously where is the FB /AC plan to protect the sea wall.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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 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?

Should have enough money from tax payer to do more of everything with out increasing the rates, just need to stop the useless spend of money.

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



**#2615**



Stop the waste of money on things that taxpayer don't use ( public housing, city rail link and so on an on).

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

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

AT are useless at doing what taxpayer need.

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

Better and safe roads, a speed camera is not for safety, is just to make money, if road would be better design nobody would be in a rush to their destination.

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

Yes on cones, and bad repairs on roads. do it right spend only one. no the \*\*\*\*\* resurfacing that is getting done.

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

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Because they are not doing what they supposed.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



**#2615**



**Tell us why:**

Looks like is going be money for some people only and not for the future of Auckland

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

Other

**Tell us here:**

Use the money to improve Auckland community no somebody pocket.

**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:**

Looks like this proposal is only to increase the rates

**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



#2615



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.	Other
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	



#2615



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?**

All the proposal looks that are made so the council can steel taxpayer money, had have long enough wasting our money only to get really good salaries and bonuses, instead of making Auckland a better place to live.

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2624**



**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:**



#2624



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>	



#2624



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?

Reduce council rates

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



**#2643**



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

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Improve infrastructure and public transport before funding cycle tracks. Tax payers have already paid well.

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

Public transport network and reliability

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

Cycle tracks, leisure centres

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

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Less hassle for tax payers

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

Government funds are misused

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



**#2643**



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?**

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:**

Do not trust the council

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



#2643



<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>



#2643



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?

Tax payers are already paying more than enough. Companies like Kiwi Rail and POAL should've used the tax payers money wisely



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?

Abolish the new incoming tax on EV Car for road use. We invested to reduce carbon emissions buying a used EV car, and now we are penalised with a new road tax.



**#2650**



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

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We do not have any of those in our area of Beachlands.

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

Withford Maraetai road improvement (enlargement where possible)

**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



#2650



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

Support



#2650



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).	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.	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.	I don't know



#2650



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

**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.

Not Important

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

Not Important



#2650



board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Beachlands



**#2650**



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: Franklin

## 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	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?



**#2675**



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)?**

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:**

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



#2675



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>
<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>



#2675



<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>	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>	Do not support
<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>	Support



#2675



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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).	Not Important



#2675



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	I don't know
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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Beachlands

**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: Franklin

## 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 whinning

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

Reduce Councilors pay and stop paying so much in contractor



**#2679**



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

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Just fix the roads before you build more

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

no

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

project managers

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

Change the operational management,Other

**Tell us why:**

sell it and don't fund new owners.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

Get a return on the money invested - the airport makes a lot of money why doesn't the council get their 11%



**#2679**



**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:**

Good business but add to limited the amount POA can actually spend and give them financial targets they must meet

**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 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?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

sell to someone for a lot of 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



#2679



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>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</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#2679



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Not Important
--	---------------



#2679



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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

I don't use any of these

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



**#2679**



silly and just a handout for most things

**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**

Karaka

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

Allow for semi rural farm land to be subdivided in karaka



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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>	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?

Please prioritise public transport to get cars off the road and put something better and more long term than buses in place. Get a rail or light rail option in to the airport. Second priority is to fix the water infrastructure. And call the government publicly to



**#2682**



account for scrapping 3 waters - cutting taxes at the government level only to push them onto council rates is a pathetic cop out and does nothing to actually help people.

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

Stop consulting on everything and get on with doing the work that needs to be done.

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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Auckland's public transport has been woefully insufficient and under invested for years. Adding more bus lanes is not a long term solution for a city this size and a sustainable way of getting cars off the road when the population is growing. Put some more rail and/or light rail in.

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

Rail/light-rail

**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, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Use what we've got better

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



**#2682**



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:**

Don't keep selling off public assets to 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?**

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



#2682



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>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>



#2682



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	I don't know
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?**

Franklin,Howick

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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	Very Important
---	----------------



#2682



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

See below for suggested priorities



#2682



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

Residential development continues in Beachlands/Maraetai/Clevedon, without the supporting infrastructure. The road improvements don't seem to be able to support the existing volume of traffic, let alone the increasing population.

The local bus service could be greatly improved and used more if it aligned to the community's needs. An hourly service that doesn't go to where people need is not helpful. The bus route does not connect with the ferry and the timetable does not support being able to use it as an alternative to driving to Pine Harbour. The area is currently in zone for Howick College, but the public bus does not go anywhere near Howick to allow for it to be used by students outside of the school bus times.

The area also needs its own high school to support the growing population.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

There was no information on this in the LTP and no information is easily available online. What is 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**

Maraetai

## 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 community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.



#2682



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.	

**Tell us why**

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

I support most priorities

**Howick Local Board Priorities**

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

Fairly Important

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



#2682



Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	Fairly Important
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	Fairly Important
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	Very Important
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.	Fairly Important
Develop a community-led climate action plan.	Not Important
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**

Provide social facilities for under-18s, so that they have something to do that doesn't cost money.

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



**#2682**



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: Franklin

## 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 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>	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?

NONE.

Stop paying ridiculous hourly rates to "consultants" and Council Executives and you can do way more without needing to charge citizens more.



**#2691**



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

Yes, ridiculously higher salaries for executives and consultants.

**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?**



#2691



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.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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	



#2691



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.	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



#2691



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

#### 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
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.	Very 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.	Very Important



#2691



Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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>	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?

Actually pay for services that are cost efficient and not just wasting money because it's taxpayers. Spend it like it's your own. Focus more more on outer suburbs. We get the least attention but pay for everyone elses cool new things but have to travel ages to go to them.



**#2750**



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

Less wasting money please. Less wasting on massive salaries for your head bosses. We are all struggling and don't have the money to cope with mote inflationary costs.

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

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Transportation is absolutely \*\*\*\*\* in Auckland and it won't get any better if we throw more money at it. Cycleways and walkways are also a waste of money especially for commuting.

**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:**

It's a waste of money and is perfectly fine the way 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:**



**#2750**



**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?**



#2750



<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>



#2750



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?

Wait for the cost of living crisis and inflation levels to go down before starting this spend. People are struggling to survive as it is. We can't afford these big dreams



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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 taking action when you lodge a complaint. I already pay a substantial amount and have lodged numerous complaints regarding overgrown trees etc and nothing gets done.

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



#2780



Stop wasting tax payer money. Perhaps reshuffle within the Organisation in order to save \$\$

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

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Because it's just a load of \*\*\*\*\*. The public transport system is hopeless and i will never use it. In order for me to get from Sth Akl to Mt Wellington I would have to catch a train and 2 buses. Don't seeing it being improved by wasting more money.

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

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

Don't feel I should be charged for scrap food wastage when I have chickens that eat my scraps and have my own organic compost going. A complete waste of money for those that don't utilise it.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

I don't use the North Harbour stadium because it's too far too travel and won't be using it so happy for it to stay as 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



**#2780**



**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:**



#2780



**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 increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#2780



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?**

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Fairly Important



#2780



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

More money wasted

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#2780**



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

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Control road management services better to reduce costs. I see people standing around, road maintenance started then left unfinished for days, road cones and signs left in place when no work is being undertaken and so on.



**#2792**



Reset speed limits on rural roads back to what they were to improve productivity by allowing people to move around the country better.

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

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stop the CRL now . WE do not know what the cost has been or what it is going to be. Not only are there ongoing operating losses to fund but the traffic impacts at significant number of crossings is yet to be understood and how its to be funded told to the public.

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

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

Cancel any further spending on cycleways. They are not used and money would be better spent on roads.

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

Other

**Tell us why:**

Sell the stadium and put the funds in the proposed investment fund. Its been a dead duck since it started.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**



**#2792**



Proceed but leave the port shares in tact. Appoint some independent smart business people to the board and ensure it returns dividends based on successful operations. You only need look offshore to find examples of very well run / profitable port operations.

**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?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Invest 50% in council operating costs and 50% into the 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:**

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#2792



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>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>



#2792



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths 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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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	Fairly Important
---	------------------



#2792



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

It is hard to support generalized statements when you do not have the real costs or plans outlined.



**#2792**



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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

The paths should be part of operational costs ad if there is not enough funds in place then its a prioritisation issue over time. This is a business and you cannot simply tap shareholders every time you want to do something

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

Clarks Beach

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#2804**



**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:**



#2804



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>	



#2804



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.	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: Franklin

## 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	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?



**#2814**



**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?**

Fixing the potholes in roads

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

Cycle Ways and bus lanes these are just a hinderance to the flow of traffic

**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:**



#2814



**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



#2814



<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>	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



#2814



6b. Do you have 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?

Manurewa

## Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Priorities

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

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

Strengthen partnerships with local mana whenua through project delivery, including Te Kete Rukuruku, completion of David Lange Park playground and improvements.	
Deliver community climate initiatives such as Low Carbon Lifestyles, and Māngere Bike Hub with our community partners.	
Deliver a community-driven safety action plan aimed at tackling anti-social behaviour and addressing local safety concerns enhancing the overall sense of safety within our local community.	
Improve employment and economic opportunities through our local economic broker programme.	
Support community-led activations at our parks and facilities through our community grants.	

Tell us why



#2814



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

I support most priorities

**Manurewa Local Board Priorities**

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

Fairly Important

**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.	Very Important
Invest in evidence-based projects that focus on crime prevention, safer communities and injury prevention.	Fairly Important
Fund and support activities that include older people and foster their community participation with a specific focus on reaching older migrants.	Fairly Important
Invest in community led projects and initiatives that respond to social connection and cohesion, build climate resilience and contribute to climate action.	Fairly Important
Develop a masterplan for Mountfort Park to ensure our open space and sports field network meets the demands of our diverse communities.	Fairly Important



#2814



Identify options for recreational activities to support people of all ages and abilities being casually active.	Fairly Important
Investigate community lease options to support Ngāti Tamaoho aspirations for a cultural hub at Te Pua/Keith Park.	Not Important
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?**

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?



**#2848**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

We already spend a lot for everything, people are very very tight with money.

**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?**



#2848



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?

<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</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#2848



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>	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.	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?**



**#2848**



## 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: Franklin

## 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	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?

Eliminate all non-essential spend. If it is not necessary to life, I don't want to pay for it.



**#2887**



**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:**



#2887



**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



#2887



<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>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>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>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>



#2887



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important



#2887



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know
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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Pukekohe East

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?



**#2906**



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:**

Your not in the businessof running ports. Just run the city



#2906



**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:**

Invest in roading

**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



#2906



<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>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></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>



#2906



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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

**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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place	Not Important



#2906



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Pukekohe

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

Your not very trustworthy.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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 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 be prepared to pay for more if the improvement was for my area. I am tired of paying for huge expensive projects for the inner city, when I live on the border between Auckland and Waikato and I never even go in to the city. I am also tired of seeing amazing parks and playgrounds being built in the city for children etc, but where we are there is almost nothing.



**#2912**



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

Seriously take a look at your council running expenses. Try and think out of the box, like hybrid work for staff so the office space used is much less, you are contributing to less traffic by staff working from home sometimes. Think of small, forward thinking ideas to save money and the environment in your day to day running as an example to other companies.

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

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Again, increasing my taxes when I almost never step foot north of Pukekohe is not fair. We don't get these increases in public transport down this way. I believe that public transport should be funded by congestion tolls on the roads, so that people who are using the roads with cars are being charged. Make the tolls on places where good public transport is available first. You can't charge tolls and penalise people when there is no other option. But from then on, use the tolls to help pay for the public transport.

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

Times are tough for many people at the moment. I think that you need to be very careful about the spending. Spending on things like good playgrounds for children will provide parents with a free option for their children to enjoy.

**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:**

I don't care about the north harbour stadium at all. I never visit and never will. I think anything to do with it should be implemented by the community and if they want to be



**#2912**



able to use it, create some form of increase in rates for those in that area who will be 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)?**

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:**

We need to reduce debt. All of the interest you are paying is wasted.

**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/half.

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

**Tell us here:**

None



#2912



**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:**

The Auckland downtown area is disgusting compared to other places in the world. So boring and nothing there. No visitors that come from overseas to see us ever say "Auckland central is a nice place to visit" all of them comment it is not nice at all.

**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>



#2912



<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>	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>	Support
<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?**



#2912



## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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).	Fairly Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly Important



#2912



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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Unmarked graves are not important. The money could be used to benefit people NOW.

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

**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**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Leave the English language signage alone

Spend rate payers money on useful projects &



**#2930**



Stop wasting money on crossings with bumps so close to roundabouts that make it impossible for a bus for instance to wait at a roundabout without causing an obstruction to the newly installed humped crossings as they have done in Pukekohe

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

Too many inconvenient cones being placed when work is finished. The cost of obstructions to the roads is out of control.

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

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

More work should be done on our roads and off peak times like it used to be in the 1980s & 90s

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

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

Cycle ways especially like the one by the southern motorway near Drury what a waste of taxpayers money overspent and really under used

**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)?**



**#2930**



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

**Tell us why:**

no brainer!

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

Other

**Tell us here:**

Get rid of the port and it's congestion!

**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:**

Continue with Matt agenda

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

**Tell us here:**

The port is not profitable so move it

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

Other

**Tell us why:**

Create a new refinery



#2930



**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>
<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>



#2930



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.	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?**

Some counsellors have an agenda and we need to be realistic Len Brown an agenda before election and would like to follow that.

**Local board priorities**

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

Franklin

**Franklin Local Board Priorities**

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

I do not support most priorities



#2930



**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
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important



**#2930**



**Tell us why**

Keep costs down and stop wasting money on fairytale agendas trying to alter Pukekohe into a walking precinct this is idiotic

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

Keep it simple & don't waste money on silly roading projects like crossings at roundabouts!

**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**

Karaka

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

Less cones & potholes!!!!& stop wasting money on cycle ways.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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 you guys are absolutely taking the \*\*\*\*\* and increasing rates with nothing to show for it and reducing services maybe you need to look at how much you pay your ridiculous staff its too much

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



#2934



Absolutely reduce your head count and ridiculous absurd salaries and costs to get stuff done. Businesses are closing and your asking for money makes no sene stop increasing rates and reducing the services you all need to get a life and and consider that kiwis are doing it tough but your asking for more come on get a grip sort your \*\*\*\*\* out

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

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

You all suck

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

No what you talking about spending more lol you dont have money no one does

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

The auckland council totally

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

your wasting tax payers money that 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)?**

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



#2934



**Tell us why:**

You have no money stop making it out like you do get smarter people i thought that why you get paid so much clearly your incompetent

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

Other

**Tell us here:**

If you think its going to deliver more profits why are you increasing the rates again useless

**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:**

Share the profits with auckland and stop lining up your \*\*\*\*\* pockets

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

**Tell us here:**

Proposal dont increase rates enough is enough

**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:**

Stop putting your fingers in the pie and if so reduce the rates get a grip



#2934



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

If not broken dont fix it come on 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>	



#2934



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?**

Im not paying dor any increases at all

**Local board priorities**

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

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

Stop increasing rates its ridiculous and people are suffering hang on you dont seem to be in touch with this concept you arrogant pricks



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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 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 public parks

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

Less property rates thanks.



**#2936**



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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Public transportation sucks

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

Small busses or similar

**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



#2936



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:

Stop giving some unnecessary tickets

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



#2936



<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>	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>	
<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>	Support
<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>	



#2936



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.

**6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
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	Fairly Important



#2936



board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not 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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Pukekohe



**#2936**



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: Franklin

## 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?

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?



**#2953**



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)?**

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**



#2953



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 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</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#2953



reduce the 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.	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.	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.	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?

Franklin



#2953



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

#### 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.	Fairly Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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



#2953



Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Stop wasting money on consultants



**#2991**



**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?**

Proper road buidling

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

Spend less on crappy road re-surfaces. Do it properly

**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)?**

**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:**



#2991



**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



#2991



<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>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>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>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>



#2991



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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place	Not Important



#2991



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Beachlands

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Keep parks going and rubbish emptied

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



**#2995**



How about, for people who don't have foot paths, dont use storm water or town water, to stop paying for everyone else. In 20 plus years the council has failed with public transport, so stop spending.

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

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Because I dont use them at all, and again this council keeps failing with transport

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

Rural traffic

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

city traffic and transport

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Do not spend 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:**



**#2995**



Again stop spending for a while

**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 get up front pay out without putting up 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:**

Rates are beyond reasonable

**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?**



#2995



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>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>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>



#2995



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.	I don't know
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?

Franklin,Papakura

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through	Fairly Important
---	------------------



#2995



projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, 'Belmont' Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Save money, people will not be able to afford their rates soon



#2995



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

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

### Papakura Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

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

We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.	Not Important
We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.	Not Important
We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.	Fairly Important



#2995



We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.	Fairly Important
Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

again lower spending

**7c. What do you think of the Papakura 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: Franklin

## 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>	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?

Fix the rural roads. Increase funding to rural halls which are the hub of the communities.

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



**#3041**



Take out layers of management and bureaucrats in council and CCOs to get more streamlined and much more efficient. No more raised crossings and other wasteful AT spending. Minimise “traffic management” and road cones. Revert the speed limits back to what they were 5 years ago. AT CEO needs to go.

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

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Do not invest Light Rail which is not suitable for Auckland. Do heavy rail spur across the vacant land from Puhinui to Airport for freight and passengers, and increase capacity of rail into the CBD from Manukau to maximise efficiency with the increased volumes. Consider a heavy rail harbour crossing/tunnel. Fix the wrecked rural roads from years of AT neglect.

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

Heavy rail spir to airport. Fixing rural roads

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

Road cones, raised crossings, stupid CBD rejuvenation projects which destroy businesses, and AT senior management (they all need to go).

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

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

Council doesn't know hire to run the stadium. Sell it or let someone else run it properly... but ultimately stop wasting money on it.



**#3041**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 can buy and sell AIAL shares at any time. The return from the investment is lower than the cost of capital to council, so it makes sense to reduce debt.

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

Other

**Tell us here:**

Sell the port land and use some of the proceeds to take stakes in Whangarei and Tauranga ports... which will get increased traffic and be more profitable because Auck Port is closed. Use other proceeds to reduce debt and improve transport infrastructure

**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.



#3041



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>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>



#3041



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.	Support
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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities



#3041



**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.	Fairly Important
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very 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.	Not Important



**#3041**



**Tell us why**

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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Bridges, culverts, and other infrastructure are key parts of providing quality paths. Unfortunately, the cost of compliance to install a simple bridge is far more than the cost of the bridge. I suggest that council develop pre-approved designs that requir

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

Ararimu

**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: Franklin

## 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 less
Parks and Community	Do less
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?



**#3076**



**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)?**

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:**



#3076



**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



#3076



<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>	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>	Support
<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



#3076



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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).	Not Important



#3076



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Very 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#3080**



**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:**



#3080



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>	



#3080



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.	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: Franklin

## 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	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?



**#3090**



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:**



#3090



**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



#3090



<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>	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>	Do not support
<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>	Support



#3090



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

<p>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.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).</p>	



#3090



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	
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.	
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Development of the Auckland CBD to somewhere we can be proud of, it's turned into a mess. Auckland transport also needs to be looked at closely and better outcomes and Investment in public transport.

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



**#3108**



Waste. Investment in things that few people use.

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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Support capping public transport

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

Public transport investment if it's actually good.

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

Cycle ways and dynamic management

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

Other

**Tell us why:**

Sell the stadium and invest in a national stadium in the waterfront or make Eden Park better. We don't need so many stadiums.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**



**#3108**



**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:**

Not in favour of selling to a third party. The port needs to be moved and auckland city invested in to become somewhere people want to go.

**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 ports are horrible and a waste of prime land. Auckland could be one of the best cities in the world if we invested into it properly.

**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



#3108



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 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>



#3108



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	Support
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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

**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	Very Important
---	----------------



#3108



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Investment in development and growth is by far the most important.



**#3108**



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

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

They need to be built faster and better if you are going to charge us for them. They are terribly maintained at the moment.

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

Clevedon

**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: Franklin

## 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 wasting money on stupid projects like cycleways next to motorways, like reducing speedlimits, like putting in more speed cameras, rather fix the roads and educate people on how to drive

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



#3125



If you want there to be a maori fund, why isnt there a pakeha fund or a Indian fund or a chinese fund. This is ridiculous, we are all one, we are all new zealanders. There should be no special treatment for anyone.

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

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Most public transport wont work, fix the roads and stop reducing speed limits. Stop putting in ridiculous 4 way pedestrian crossing in at roundabouts, one crossing further down would suffice. Lease out the ferry crossings.

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

Fix the roads - start road user mileage for evs and hybrids

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

No more cycleways, walkways that only a handfull use anyway. Parks are way too many, rather focus on a select few and improve those.

Stop with this environmental \*\*\*\*\*. % of CO2 in atmosphere is 0.04%. NZ CO2 contribution is 0.09% of that. Wake up people!!!!!!

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Dont care much about it to be honest

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



**#3125**



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

**Tell us why:**

Its going to cost too much right now, we can revisit this option in the 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:**

Sorry to say but local council is very bad at managing something like this, lease would be the way to go and put the money else where, no the 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?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Dont continue, lease it.

**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



#3125



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>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#3125



businesses and raises the share paid 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>	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.	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.	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?**

Franklin



#3125



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

#### 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.	Fairly Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important



#3125



Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Dont waste money, serve all people.

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

Ok, bar some which is a waste

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Fix the roads first

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

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?

Better planning when delivering projects. Increasing efficiencies. More park and ride services and reliable public transport

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



**#3135**



Less cycleways away from the central city and less raised pedestrian crossings.

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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It makes sense. Capacity needs to be increased on already busy routes.

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

Increasing capacity on well used public transport routes.

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

Raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways. They are not used in the Franklin district.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Sale of unused land makes sense. The more it is used, the better value it provides.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 makes sense.



**#3135**



**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 service delivers more efficient operations

**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:**

Auckland has a massive waterfront and the loss of efficiency at the port is not worth the extra area gained. Better to develop Wynyard or Aotea Square better.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#3135



**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>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>Do not support</p>



#3135



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Not Important



#3135



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

It's too much and too broad.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#3135**



The current paths are not maintained, there is no point building more for them to not be maintained either.

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

Clevedon

**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: Franklin

## 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?

2 lanes each way Whitford Maraetai Road or add an alternate route other than via Clevedon

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



**#3145**



Auckland City Centre Development

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

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Don't feel it will benefit me

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

2 lanes each way Whitford Maraetai Road or add an alternate route other than via Clevedon

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

Auckland City Centre Development

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

It will not do anything for me

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

We need future renewable cash generators



**#3145**



**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:**

Decrease costs and create a possibly better revenue generator

**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:**

Spend less, do less

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

Other

**Tell us why:**

Do what ever is cheapest or will make the most revenue

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

Other



#3145



**Tell us why:**

Do what ever is cheapest or will make the most revenue

**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>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>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>



#3145



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths 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.	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.	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?**

do less , spend less

## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

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

Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through	Not Important
---	---------------



#3145



<p>projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, 'Belmont' Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>

**Tell us why**

spend less, do less



**#3145**



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

spend less, do less

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

spend less, do less

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

Beachlands

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

spend less, do 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: Franklin

## 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?

Fix the roads instead of soeed cameras in rural south auckland. Stop wasting our rates on excessive projects for downturn. Not all auckland uses this.

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



**#3150**



Wasting money on silly road programs and cultural activities and give us what we need  
. Decent public transport and roads. No more.

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

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

No more tax. Our fuel is so high already. Sick of spending money on speed cameras when u can't fix the roads for more than 12 months!!! But can install 4 cameras on the same busted piece of road.

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

Sort the train to pukekohe out.

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

Forget wasting money on cultural events in downturn the majority of aucklanders don't want or use

**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:**



**#3150**



Tighten up your already large budget. Pick providers who can do the job effectively without all the overheads. ie not the massive fletcher's etc

**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:**

How did the viaduct development go? No more lease 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:**

Invest in the Port. It's our lifeline

**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's our life line. Do not change it

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



#3150



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>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>



#3150



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths 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.	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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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	Fairly Important
---	------------------



#3150



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Very 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?**



**#3150**



**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**

Waiau Pa

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?

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?



**#3156**



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?**

Pedestrian and bicycle lane's

**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:**



#3156



**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



#3156



<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>	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>	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>	Do not support
<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



#3156



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important



#3156



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not 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?**

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Where we live there will be no benefit so we will not pay for 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**

Awhitu

**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: Franklin

## 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?

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?



**#3197**



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)?**

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?**

I don't know



#3197



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>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>



#3197



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.	Support
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?**



#3197



## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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
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.	Very 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



#3197



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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

**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**

**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: Franklin

## 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>	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?

More activities for young people. Skate parks, pump tracks etc

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

Community events if it meant fixing dangerous roads that have worn out



**#3205**



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

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need public transport that's reliable. People have to drive. People don't have lots of cash. You are saying, well you have to drive to work, let's chunk on another expense to your day. Cancelling cycleways so people can't ride to work either. Seems fucked

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

Public transport that's reliable and affordable

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

New roads

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

There's more important 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)?**

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

**Tell us why:**



**#3205**



**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:**

**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?**



#3205



<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>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the 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>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>I don't know</p>



#3205



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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Fairly Important



#3205



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	I don't know
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know
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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	I don't know
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

I feel like there's a lot that should be done but only so much can. Roads are stuffed and no public transport out waiuku ways. Some money should be spent on getting what we have now working better

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



**#3205**



**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**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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?

Roads. And keep rubbish at weekly pick up

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



**#3237**



**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?**

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?**



#3237



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 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>



#3237



<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>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>I don't know</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>I don't know</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?**



#3237



## Local board priorities

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

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly Important



#3237



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.	Very 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?**

**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**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?

A ferry link between Manukau Harbour and Auckland

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



**#3240**



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

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need more transport links.

**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:**

Auckland council must have a say in the international 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



#3240



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

Support



#3240



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>	
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.	Support
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



#3240



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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.	Not Important



#3240



Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly 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.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

To have a ferry link between Manukau Harbour and Acukland

**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**

Clarks Beach



**#3240**



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: Franklin

## 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	
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?

public transport

Active Transport

Walking and Cycling across Auckland harbour bridge - Annex the bridge



**#3251**



Get wellington out of Auckland

Extend Auckland Transport to include Rural Districts - Rodney & Franklin

Empower communities to build green corridors on Unformed legal roads and reserves  
- just enable the permissins, we'll do the rest. ie stop stopping us !

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

AT endless consultation and report writing - it gets old. Fail Fast.

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

**Tell us why:**

re-establish the cancelled cycle paths for kids, commuters and the rest of us

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Active Transport, mode choice, climate resilience.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

\$51 M of harbour bridge consultancy

**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)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#3251**



**Tell us why:**

short termism - John Banks sold a fortune of AIA shares for tiny gain, do be a john banks

**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:**

seriously - why ask us this question. Without understandig the port operation the answer is meaningless, as is the results of this question.

**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 move the port to a better location, and free up waterfront to make Auckland a viable toourist destination in the future; Not apartments.

**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.



#3251



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>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>



#3251



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.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#3251



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.	
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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Very Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	
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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important



**#3251**



### **Tell us why**

Franklin is impossible for young kids/teenagers to get around. Mobility is dangerous, busses non existent where i live. Its a backwater - do better.

Develop fit for purpose facilities is a meaningless phrase, repeated every plan cycle. Do better.

### **7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Empower communities with permission to improve their environment and placemaking. Your approval process is not fit for purpose, and holding our people back. Support your people and communities who want to make a difference.

### **Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Im receiving feedback that people who support the concept and funding have no paths or trails planned near them. Its too targetted so no value. Imcrease your ambition Franklin. As cars get expensive to run/park/insure, this investment will look better and

### **As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Clarks Beach

### **8. Do you have any other comments?**

Auckland Transport appears to stop at Papakura. Mobility in Franklin is drive baby drive, which is a fail for all our resident non-drivers.

Fund the Manukau Fast Ferry to Onehunga. Get multi mode corridors working as per the business case from the support growth team - do not let it slide.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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	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?

I would like to have fast and reliable public transportation from Franklin area to cbd. Atleast make the new drury and paerata stations come quicker.

No I don't want to pay more sorry, we have been charged so much for a very very poor service in the last 2 years- several canceled services, its just embarrassing for a developed country.



**#3253**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Please stop giving taxpayers money for people who can work!

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

A system should run every efficient in a developed country so there are no excuses if you have poor transportation. The more the city gets connected the better people can spread out and buy house and help develop new developments.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Are you guys joking? Aucklenders are already paying more for everything, please don't ask such questions it's just a disgrace.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Public transport should be cheap and affordable not expensive and inaccessible

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Invest heavily on public transportation which is a basic yet important need for a city to function. A new stadium is not solving anything.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



**#3253**



**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?**

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



#3253



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. 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</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3253



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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

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
--	----------------



#3253



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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuānuku (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.	Very 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?**



**#3253**



**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**

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: Franklin

## 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?



**#3290**



**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:**



#3290



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>	



#3290



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: Franklin

## 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?



**#3299**



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:**

Need to get Community Ownership / major funders involved.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**



#3299



**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



#3299



<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>	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>	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>	Do not support
<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



#3299



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

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.	Not Important
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important



#3299



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**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**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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	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?

Water treatment and supply to all houses

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cut non essential services. Events, arts. Anthing thats not essential



**#3313**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Investment in reliability but most of these don't do that

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Reliability of transport roads, trains.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycles ways bus lanes speed restrictions

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Needs to be self funded

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 revenue

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#3313**



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:**

Revenue

**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:**

Cut to essential services and invest in future

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Council's should provides essential services only.

Transport, water treatment and supply, waste collection, resource consenting. All non essential should go.

**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:**

Business needs to run

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#3313



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>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>



#3313



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths 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.	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?

Franklin,Howick,Papakura

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

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	Very Important
---	----------------



#3313



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Not esse tial



#3313



7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Infrastructure is important everything else not essential

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

Whitford

## 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 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.	



#3313



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.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I do not support any priorities

**Howick Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?**

Not Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	Not Important
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	Not Important
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	Not Important
Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have	Not Important



#3313



on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses.	
Develop a community-led climate action plan.	Not Important
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.	Non essential

**Tell us why**

Terrible non essential

**7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Papakura Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Papakura in 2024/2025?**

I do not support any priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.	Not Important
--	---------------



#3313



<p>We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>
<p>We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.</p>	<p>Fairly Important</p>
<p>Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.</p>	<p>Not Important</p>

**Tell us why**

None essential

**7c. What do you think of the Papakura proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Terrible non essential

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

We should only be funding g essential 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: Franklin

## 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	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?



**#3337**



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?**

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:**

**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



#3337



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>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</p>	<p>Support</p>



#3337



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.	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?**



**#3337**



## 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: Franklin

## 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	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?

Giving Stickland transport funding.

Stop the idiotic speed humps and cycle lanes.



**#3347**



They only put them in poor areas as there is no community push back.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Make it targeted. 1we pay for our public transport options - the ferry.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycle lanes and speed humps

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Only a small percentage of population use the stadium.

Make it a targeted rate for 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:**



**#3347**



**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:**

I don't trust the current council to sell off large stakeholding and capital

**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:**

More cost to redevelop, and less income.



#3347



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>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>Do not support</p>



#3347



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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

Other

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.	Not Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Not Important



#3347



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly 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.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#3347**



**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Beachlands

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#3369**



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?**

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?**



#3369



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>
<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>



#3369



<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>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>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>I don't know</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>I don't know</p>



#3369



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

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
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).	Not Important



#3369



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly 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.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**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**

**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: Franklin

## 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 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?



**#3444**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The raised pedestrian crossings are not a priority fixing the roads is and footpaths

**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?**



#3444



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>
<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>



#3444



<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>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>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>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>



#3444



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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.	Very 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



#3444



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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

The cemetery monument is the most important of these

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I feel that they are ok

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

The Pukekohe to paerata path is very important but also needs to stretch all the way to paerata rise

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Paerata



**#3444**



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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Bike lanes, changing roads when there are no issues with them .



**#3455**



**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:**



#3455



**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



#3455



<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>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>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>



#3455



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important



#3455



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**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**

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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?

On the topic of Water - managing stormwater to minimise flooding and protect waterways

I would like to see Auckland council do more of:



**#3458**



1. Green Infrastructure Development: Auckland Council can invest in the development of green infrastructure, such as constructed wetlands and vegetated swales, which mimic natural hydrological processes to manage stormwater. These green spaces not only capture and store stormwater but also provide habitat for wildlife, enhance urban aesthetics, and improve air quality.

2. Floodplain Restoration: Auckland Council should do more of restoring natural floodplains and wetlands which can act as natural buffers against flooding by absorbing excess water during storms. This approach not only reduces flood risk for downstream communities but also improves water quality by filtering pollutants and sediments before they reach waterways.

3. Community Engagement and Education: Auckland Council should engage local communities in ecological restoration projects to foster a sense of environmental stewardship and empower citizens to take ownership of their local ecosystems. Educational programs on the importance of wetlands, riparian buffers, and other natural features can raise awareness and inspire collective action for sustainable stormwater management.

4. Targeted Investment in Vulnerable Communities: Auckland Council should prioritize investment in stormwater infrastructure in neighborhoods that are disproportionately affected by flooding and water pollution. This ensures that resources are directed toward communities most in need and helps alleviate social disparities in access to clean water and flood protection.

5. Equitable Access to Green Spaces: Auckland Council should ensure access to green spaces and recreational areas which are essential for community well-being, particularly in urban areas. By integrating stormwater management with the creation of green spaces, the council can enhance the quality of life for residents while addressing environmental challenges.

6. Community-Based Participatory Planning: Auckland Council should engage local residents, especially those from marginalized communities, in the planning and decision-making processes for stormwater management projects is crucial for ensuring that their voices are heard and their needs are addressed. This approach fosters trust between communities and local government, leading to more effective and equitable outcomes.

7. Regulation of Private Development: Auckland Council plays a key role in regulating private development to prevent excessive impervious surfaces and ensure that stormwater runoff is managed responsibly. By enacting and enforcing stringent land use regulations, councils can protect waterways from pollution and degradation while preserving natural habitats.



**#3458**



8. Investment in Public Infrastructure: Auckland Council investment in stormwater infrastructure, such as drainage systems and flood control measures, is essential for safeguarding the integrity of waterways and protecting communities from the impacts of climate change. By prioritizing public ownership and investment, local councils can ensure that stormwater management serves the common good rather than private interests.

9. Integration of Climate Resilience: Stormwater management plans should be integrated with broader climate adaptation strategies to build resilience against extreme weather events and sea-level rise. This may include incorporating climate projections into infrastructure design, implementing nature-based solutions, and adopting flexible management approaches that can adapt to changing conditions.

10. Promotion of Low-Carbon Practices: Auckland Council should promote low-carbon stormwater management practices, such as green infrastructure and decentralized water systems, which not only reduce flood risk but also contribute to mitigating climate change by sequestering carbon and reducing energy consumption.

11. Community Resilience Planning: Auckland Council should be engaging local communities in resilience planning ensures that local knowledge and priorities are integrated into decision-making processes. Empowering communities to identify their vulnerabilities and develop adaptive strategies fosters self-reliance and enhances overall resilience to climate impacts.

On the topic of city and local development: Deliver urban regeneration and lead development of the city centre.

Urban regeneration and the development of city centers like Auckland are critical for several reasons, aligning with principles of sustainability, equity, and community well-being. I would like to see Auckland Council do more of the following:

1. Sustainable Land Use: Urban regeneration emphasizes the efficient use of land within existing urban areas, reducing sprawl and preserving natural habitats outside the city. This approach promotes densification and mixed land-use development, which can minimize the ecological footprint associated with urban expansion.

2. Resource Efficiency: Concentrating development in city centers allows for the efficient provision of infrastructure and services, such as public transportation, water, and energy systems. This can reduce per capita resource consumption and greenhouse gas emissions compared to dispersed suburban development patterns.

3. Social Equity: By revitalizing city centers, council policies can help address socioeconomic disparities within urban areas. Investment in affordable housing, public spaces, and community facilities can make cities more accessible and inclusive for



**#3458**



people of all income levels, promoting social cohesion and reducing spatial inequalities.

4. **Public Ownership and Control:** Democratic control over key sectors of the economy, including land and urban development is important to maintain. Through mechanisms such as public ownership of land and participatory decision-making processes, Auckland Council can ensure that urban regeneration projects prioritize the needs and interests of local communities.

5. **Environmental Justice:** Urban regeneration can contribute to positive outcomes by remedying the legacy of environmental degradation and social neglect in historically marginalized neighborhoods. By focusing investment and resources on these areas, council policies can address issues such as pollution, inadequate infrastructure, and lack of access to green spaces, improving quality of life for residents while promoting ecological sustainability.

6. **Local Economic Development:** Council should focus on urban regeneration which prioritizes local economic development and job creation, particularly in sectors such as renewable energy, public transit, and sustainable construction. By supporting small businesses, cooperatives, and social enterprises, Auckland Council can foster a more resilient and equitable economy that serves the needs of local communities.

On the topic of environment and regulation: Protecting and restoring our natural environment in Auckland is of paramount importance for several reasons, which align with the Long Term Plan and I would like to see Auckland Council do more in this area.

1. **Expand Protected Areas:** Auckland Council should increase the establishment of protected areas, such as regional parks, marine reserves, and ecological corridors, to safeguard biodiversity and ecosystems. The Council should also prioritize the protection of critical habitats, including wetlands, forests, and coastal areas, which are essential for maintaining ecological balance and resilience in the face of environmental changes.

2. **Promote Sustainable Land Use Practices:** Council should encourage sustainable land use practices, such as agroecology and regenerative agriculture, that prioritize soil health, biodiversity conservation, and carbon sequestration. They should also provide support and incentives for farmers and landowners to adopt practices that enhance ecosystem services and promote ecological resilience. This can be supported by local food security and resilience. By protecting and restoring natural environments in Auckland, such as farmland and coastal ecosystems, Council can support local food production and enhance food security and resilience. By promoting sustainable agriculture and fisheries practices, Auckland Council can reduce reliance on imported food and strengthen the resilience of local food systems to external shocks and disruptions.



**#3458**



3. **Invest in Ecological Restoration:** Allocate resources and funding for ecological restoration projects aimed at restoring degraded ecosystems and habitats. This could involve initiatives such as native tree planting, wetland restoration, and revegetation efforts to enhance biodiversity, improve water quality, and mitigate the impacts of climate change.
4. **Support Community-Led Conservation Initiatives:** Council should empower local communities to participate in conservation efforts through community-led projects and initiatives. Provide funding, technical assistance, and capacity-building support to community groups, NGOs, and indigenous Māori organizations engaged in grassroots conservation activities.
5. **Promote Environmental Education and Awareness:** Council should increase public awareness and understanding of the importance of protecting and restoring the natural environment through environmental education programs, outreach campaigns, and public engagement activities. Council should foster a culture of environmental stewardship and collective responsibility for the care of natural resources among residents of Auckland.
6. **Implement Policies for Sustainable Urban Planning:** Council should integrate principles of ecological sustainability into urban planning and development processes, such as promoting green infrastructure, sustainable transportation options, and compact, mixed-use development patterns. Encourage the incorporation of green spaces, urban parks, and native vegetation into urban design to enhance biodiversity and improve the quality of life for city residents.
7. **Transition to Renewable Energy:** Auckland Council could accelerate the transition to renewable energy sources, such as wind and solar to reduce dependence on fossil fuels and mitigate climate change. This could be achieved through implementing policies and incentives to support the adoption of renewable energy technologies and promote energy efficiency measures at the local level.
8. **Ecosystem Health:** The natural environment provides essential ecosystem services, such as clean air, clean water, and fertile soil, which are vital for Auckland's survival and well-being. Protecting and restoring natural habitats in Auckland, such as forests, wetlands, and marine ecosystems, helps maintain biodiversity and ecological balance, which are essential for the resilience of ecosystems in the face of environmental changes and disturbances.
9. **Climate Resilience:** The protection and restoration of natural environments, such as forests and coastal ecosystems, can help mitigate the impacts of climate change by sequestering carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and reducing the risk of extreme weather events such as flooding and erosion. By preserving and enhancing natural



**#3458**



carbon sinks, Auckland can contribute to global efforts to mitigate climate change while also enhancing local climate resilience.

10. **Equitable Access to Nature:** Access to nature and green spaces is essential for Aucklanders health and well-being, providing opportunities for recreation, relaxation, and connection with the natural world. However, access to green spaces is often unequal, with marginalized communities disproportionately lacking access to parks and other natural amenities. By prioritizing the protection and restoration of natural environments in underserved areas, Auckland Council can promote social equity and ensure that all residents have access to the benefits of nature.

11. **Indigenous Rights and Sovereignty:** In Auckland, protecting and restoring natural environments involves recognizing and upholding the rights and interests of Māori who have deep cultural and spiritual connections to the land and sea. By partnering with Māori communities and honoring their traditional ecological knowledge, Auckland Council can promote environmental stewardship and advance the goals of ecological sustainability and social justice.

12. **Democratic Control and Public Ownership:** By prioritizing the protection and restoration of natural environments, Auckland Council can ensure that these vital resources are managed in the public interest, rather than being exploited. Public ownership and democratic control also allow for greater transparency, accountability, and community participation in decision-making processes related to environmental management and conservation.

On the topic of parks and community: A wide range of arts, sports, recreation, library and community services including a fair level of funding for local boards

1. **Equitable Funding Distribution:** Council should ensure fair and equitable distribution of funding for local boards to support diverse community needs and priorities across different neighborhoods. This can be done by prioritizing areas with historically underfunded communities or those facing socio-economic challenges to address inequalities in access to arts, sports, recreation, library, and community services.

2. **Community Participation and Decision-Making:** Council should empower local communities to participate in decision-making processes related to the allocation of resources and the provision of services. Council can do this by adopting participatory budgeting mechanisms that allow residents to have a direct say in how public funds are spent on arts, sports, recreation, library, and community initiatives in their neighborhoods.

3. **Promote Accessibility and Inclusivity:** Council should ensure that arts, sports, recreation, library, and community services are accessible to all residents, regardless of socio-economic status, ethnicity, age, or ability. Council should invest in



**#3458**



infrastructure and programs that cater to the needs of marginalized and underrepresented groups, such as people with disabilities, Māori communities, and low-income families.

4. **Support Local Cultural and Creative Industries:** Council can provide funding and resources to support local artists, cultural organizations, and creative industries, including grassroots initiatives and community-led arts projects. This can be done through promoting cultural diversity and expression by showcasing the work of artists from diverse backgrounds and supporting culturally specific programs and events.

5. **Invest in Public Spaces and Facilities:** Council should develop and maintain public spaces, facilities, and amenities that facilitate arts, sports, recreation, library, and community activities. This includes parks, community centers, sports complexes, libraries, theaters, and cultural venues that serve as hubs for social interaction, creative expression, and physical activity.

6. **Build Resilient Communities:** Council should foster strong and resilient communities through arts, sports, recreation, library, and community services that promote social cohesion, solidarity, and mutual support - by providing opportunities for residents to come together, collaborate, and build collective capacity to address local challenges and opportunities.

On the topic of council support: Supporting the delivery of services, enabling effective governance, emergency management and grants to regional amenities.

1. **Community-Centered Service Delivery:** Council should prioritize the delivery of essential services based on the needs and priorities of local communities. Adopt a community-centered approach that involves meaningful consultation and collaboration with residents to ensure that services are accessible, responsive, and culturally appropriate - not just a once off consultation document.

2. **Democratic Governance and Participation:** Council should promote democratic governance structures that empower communities to participate in decision-making processes at the local and regional levels. This could involve decentralizing decision-making authority, expanding opportunities for public consultation and engagement, and ensuring transparency and accountability in governance practices.

3. **Emergency Preparedness and Response:** Council needs to strengthen emergency management capabilities to effectively respond to natural disasters, pandemics, and other emergencies. Invest in disaster preparedness, risk reduction, and resilience-building measures, including early warning systems, evacuation plans, and community-based response mechanisms. Ensure that emergency management efforts prioritize the needs of vulnerable populations and marginalized communities.



**#3458**



4. Support for Regional Amenities: Council should provide financial support and grants to regional amenities, such as cultural institutions, recreational facilities, and environmental conservation projects, that contribute to the well-being and quality of life of residents. Prioritize initiatives that promote public access, environmental sustainability, and social equity, while also supporting local economies and job creation.

Collaboration with Regional Partners: Council should foster collaboration and partnerships with regional stakeholders, including neighbouring municipalities, indigenous communities, non-profit organizations, and businesses, to address shared challenges and opportunities. By working together, Auckland Council can leverage collective resources and expertise to achieve common goals related to service delivery, governance, emergency management, and regional development.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

1. Outsourcing public services to private corporations. Provision of essential services by Auckland Council should be provided by the council. Where there are gaps in expertise - investment into council workers should be made. Outsourcing services like to private companies can lead to profit-driven motives, inequality, and decreased accountability.

2. Prioritizing 'profit' or unnecessary fiscal responsibility over people. Auckland Council should refrain from policies that prioritize economic growth or corporate interests at the expense of ratepayers, social welfare, and environmental sustainability.

3. Ignoring community input and participation: Robust and meaningful democratic decision-making processes that involve and empower local communities should be prioritized. Auckland Council should engage in more participatory governance practices, such as citizen assemblies, citizen forums, and cooperative planning, to ensure that residents have a voice in shaping local policies and initiatives.

4. Neglecting affordable housing and homelessness: While not something the council explicitly provides, council planning does impact outcomes. Housing is a fundamental human right. Auckland Council should focus on planning for affordable housing options for all residents and addressing homelessness through supportive housing programs and council services.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal



**#3458**



### Tell us why:

I do not support much of the proposal as it is anchored in the status quo approach to managing transport. The delivery of transportation by Auckland Council should prioritize principles of sustainability, equity, and community well-being. Here's how the transport section of the long term plan should be focussed:

1. **Public Ownership and Control:** Auckland Council should prioritize public ownership of critical transportation infrastructure, such as roads, public transit systems, and cycling and pedestrian infrastructure, to ensure that transportation services are managed in the public interest.
2. **Investment in Public Transit:** Council should promote and prioritize investment in public transit systems, such as electric buses, trains, ferries, light rail, and rail as sustainable and equitable alternatives to private car travel and the business-as-usual transport sector. Expand and improve public transit networks to provide free, reliable, and accessible transportation options for all residents, reduce congestion and greenhouse gas emissions, and promote social inclusion and mobility.
3. **Active Transportation Infrastructure:** Council should support investment in infrastructure to support active modes of transportation, such as walking and cycling, as sustainable and healthy alternatives to private car travel. Build and maintain safe and accessible walking and cycling paths, seperated bike lanes, and pedestrian-friendly streets to encourage active transportation, improve public health, and reduce dependence on fossil fuels.
4. **Free and Accessible Transportation:** Council should ensure that transportation services are free and accessible to all residents, regardless of income, age, ability, or location. Implement fare-free policies to make public transit more accessible and desirable for all individuals and families, provide accessible transportation options for people with disabilities and seniors, and prioritize underserved communities in transportation planning and investment decisions.
5. **Prioritize Environmental Sustainability:** Council should promote environmentally sustainable transportation practices and technologies to reduce the carbon footprint and ecological impact of transportation systems. Invest in electric and zero-emission vehicles, renewable energy sources for public transit, and infrastructure for car-sharing and electric vehicle charging to accelerate the transition to a low-carbon transportation system.
6. **Integrated Land Use and Transportation Planning:** Council needs to integrate land use and transportation planning to create compact, mixed-use developments that minimize the need for car travel and support sustainable transportation options.



**#3458**



Prioritize transit-oriented development, pedestrian-friendly urban design, and mixed-use zoning to create walkable and bikeable communities, reduce sprawl, and enhance quality of life.

7. Community Engagement and Participation: Council should involve local communities, stakeholders, and transit users in transportation planning and decision-making processes to ensure that transportation services meet the needs and priorities of residents. Adopt participatory planning approaches, such as community workshops, public forums, and advisory committees, to solicit feedback, ideas, and input from diverse perspectives.

By delivering transportation services in line with these principles, Auckland Council can promote sustainability, equity, and community well-being, while also addressing the interconnected challenges of climate change, social inequality, and urban sprawl as needed by the people of Auckland.

**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)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



**#3458**



I believe the Auckland Future fund should be established but along different lines to those proposed. Establishing a future fund modeled after the highly successful Norwegian Sovereign Wealth Fund in Auckland by Council for all Aucklanders is a great strategic move towards economic sustainability, equity, and better outcomes for the city.

1. **Resource Nationalization:** Auckland Council could explore by taking public ownership of key resources within its jurisdiction. This could include land, water, energy sources, and other natural assets. By doing so, the council ensures that the wealth generated from these resources remains in public ownership rather than being exploited.
2. **Divestment from Fossil Fuels:** Auckland Council needs to transition away from use of fossil fuels. Council should divest its investments from fossil fuel related industries and businesses and redirect these funds into sustainable and renewable energy projects.
3. **Public Ownership of Strategic Industries:** Auckland Council should consider public ownership or significant stakes in strategic industries such as transportation (AIAL), infrastructure (POAL), and utilities (WaterCare). Revenue generated from these industries can contribute to the future fund while ensuring that essential services remain accessible and affordable to all residents. Further, the assets of council should not be sold, diluted, or transferred out of public ownership. Auckland Council should prioritize public ownership of council assets and critical infrastructure to ensure that the value of these assets is not lost and are managed in the public interest.
4. **Democratic Control and Transparency:** It's crucial that the management of the future fund remains democratic and transparent. Community involvement and decision-making in economic matters should be prioritised. Auckland Council should establish mechanisms for public oversight and participation in the governance of the future fund to ensure that it serves the interests of the Aucklanders.
5. **Investment in Social and Environmental Initiatives:** The primary goal of the future fund should not be solely financial returns but also social and environmental well-being. Investments should prioritize projects and initiatives that promote sustainability, reduce inequality, and enhance the quality of life for all Auckland residents. This could include funding affordable housing, public transportation, renewable energy infrastructure, and conservation efforts.
6. **International Solidarity:** Auckland Council could explore partnerships with other municipalities, organizations, and countries that share similar values and goals. Collaborative efforts can amplify the impact of the future fund and promote eco-socialist principles on a broader scale.



**#3458**



By implementing these strategies, Auckland Council can establish a future fund that not only generates wealth but also advances economic democracy, sustainability, and social justice. Such a fund would serve as a model for equitable and environmentally conscious economic development, benefiting current and future generations of Aucklanders.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

I support Council ownership of POAL with the management and oversight structure changing from the separate corporate structure (status quo) to that of direct oversight, ownership, and operation by council. However POAL dividends would be invested into the Auckland Future Fund as described in 4a.

**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:**

Per answer in 4a.

**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:**



#3458



**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).	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



#3458



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.	Support
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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#3458



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
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Very Important



**#3458**



**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

I am writing to express my strong support for the proposal to implement a targeted rate of \$1 a week, \$52 a year, for 10 years, to fund the construction of new separated bike paths connecting Clarks Beach and Waiiau Pa. These villages, situated on the south

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Clarks Beach

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I champion public consultation. It is important the public's views are taken into account on community projects/programmes that affect them - especially long term plans which cover a wide variety of critical topics.

However, sometimes these processes can feel like death by consultation. Where it feels like you submit endlessly on these significantly detailed proposals/projects, which may go through several rounds of consultation - but then fail to see your views reflected in the outcome - if there is one within a reasonable timeframe (less than 3 years).

I would like to see something more experimental, inclusive and empowering democratic process such as a citizens assembly.

A citizen assembly, also known as a citizens' assembly or a citizens' jury, is a democratic and participatory process designed to engage a representative group of ordinary citizens in discussions, deliberations, and decision-making on important issues or policy matters. It is a form of deliberative democracy where randomly selected citizens come together to learn about and discuss a specific topic, analyze different viewpoints, and ultimately provide informed recommendations or decisions to policymakers.

Key characteristics of a citizen assembly include:



**#3458**



#### 1. Random Selection:

Participants are typically selected through a random process, often similar to how jurors are selected for legal trials. This helps ensure a diverse and representative group of citizens, minimizing bias and the influence of special interests.

#### 2. Deliberation:

Participants engage in in-depth discussions and deliberations about the issue at hand. They have the opportunity to learn from experts, ask questions, and exchange perspectives.

#### 3. Informed Decision-Making:

The process aims to provide participants with balanced and accurate information about the topic. This empowers them to make informed decisions and recommendations.

#### 4. Time and Resources:

Citizen assemblies are usually held over an extended period to allow participants to fully understand the complexity of the issue and deliberate thoughtfully.

#### 5. Facilitation:

Skilled facilitators guide the discussions, ensuring that the process remains respectful, balanced, and focused on the topic. Facilitators help participants explore different viewpoints and reach consensus if possible.

#### 6. Recommendations:

At the end of the process, the citizen assembly produces recommendations, suggestions, or decisions that are based on their collective deliberations. These recommendations are then presented to policymakers or the public.

#### 7. Impact:

Depending on the context and the level of influence granted to the assembly, their recommendations can have varying degrees of impact, from advisory to potentially binding.

This process should be applied to something as important, impactful, and significant as the Long Term Plan - not only to improve outcomes, but as a trial of a different approach to consultation and involvement by Auckland Residents.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?

no this is not the economic times to expect people to pay more.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3468**



I would like to see council contractors be more efficient with their time. I would also like to see council stop silly time wasting practices when ratepayers apply for consents, etc.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Most of it is needed. I especially agree with cutting more cycleways and raised pedestrian crossings. More consultation with suburb locals should be done so unnecessary money is not spent or is better spent.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Consultation with suburb locals to find out what is really needed in their towns.Spp

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Speed cameras.

**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 unnecessarily. Make use of what is already there by thinking how it can be used better and pay for itself.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



**#3468**



**Tell us why:**

I'm not knowledgeable enough on the subject to have a strong opinion.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I'm not knowledgeable enough on the subject to have a strong opinion.

**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 mind either way.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No thanks.

**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:**

Why change it.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#3468



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

I don't see a good enough reasoning to change.

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. 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	I don't know



#3468



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.	I don't know
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 thanks.

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#3468



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
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.	I don't know
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	I don't know
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know
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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	I don't know
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.	Very Important



**#3468**



**Tell us why**

I'm not sure I agree with less rubbish bins. If you want dog walkers to be responsible and pick up the dog poo, they need bins. There is none in Paerata Rise, even none in the dog park! There is also none in new parts of Patumahoe. Yet some areas have

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It's not fantastic but not bad either.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Any amount of rates rise is going to hard for people at the moment.

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Patumahoe

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

More consultation with locals needs to happen.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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. We can't afford your rates bill now let alone an increase.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3508**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

People can't afford the increased costs.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

NO

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce your operating costs.

**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:**

Council must reduce their debt burden..

**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



#3508



Tell us here:

Council must reduce their fixed costs and debt burden.

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



#3508



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 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.	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.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#3508



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

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
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



#3508



Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Reduce operating costs

**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**

Pukekohe East



**#3508**



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: Franklin

## 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	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 resilient water and road infrastructure.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3524**



Less rate payer funding for libraries, stadiums that are hardly used. Should be user pays or sold.

**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:**

Live on the other side of town, will never go there. Don't want to pay for 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:**

Much smarter to be in a diverse fund with possible better returns or pay down debt. However still believe funds should be mostly invested in NZ infrastructure.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#3524**



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 needs to focus on its core business. Not be involved in the operation of ports, especially at a cost to ratepayers.

**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:**

Lower rates. People deserve to keep more of their own money, rather than have it invested by 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?**

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:**

Would be a good trail to see if it is worth wrapping up the rest of the port for urban development, or leaving as is.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#3524



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

The city desperately needs more housing. An urban development in this area would be awesome. The port is valuable to Auckland, but the city's future likely lies in other industries.

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



#3524



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.	Support
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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#3524



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
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know
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.	Very 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.	Not Important



**#3524**



**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**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**

Beachlands

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#3526**



**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:**



#3526



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>	



#3526



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#3531**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycleways should not 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?**

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:**



#3531



**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.	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



#3531



<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>	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



**#3531**



**6b. Do you have 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: Franklin

## 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 with the stealing money from ratepayers, you already get plenty from us. You look like a pack of criminals stealing money like you do.

Start using the money you get wisely and stop the back handers to each other.



**#3557**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop giving yourselves so much money. You are our servants yet you pay yourself a Mint.

**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?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Your wages! I'd spend less on that because you do nothing for the money you get.

**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:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



#3557



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



#3557



<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>



**#3557**



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?**

Don't increase rates, don't increase your wages because you don't deserve it or work hard enough for it.

To be quite frank, the auckland council looks like a criminal organization stealing from us all

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

STOP STEALING FROM US!!!!



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Get the petrol prices down



**#3598**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We should do everything that helps the information rate go down first

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

NO

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Car registration

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

No luxury money available these days!

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

See above answer



**#3598**



**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 might 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:**

We have bigger needs to finish what the council started

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Thanks

**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:**

Public benefits always come first

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#3598



**Tell us why:**

Not sure about the future

**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>I don't know</p>



#3598



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths 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?

Keep it at minimum please

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

No thanks



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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	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 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 would not be prepared to pay more. However, the council could be more efficient to reduce bureaucracy, unnecessary processes, reduce personnel where possible. The council spends money like if there’s no tomorrow.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3622**



Definitely! Simplify processes, remove bureaucracy, eliminate departments which spend too much money for what they bring. Focus more on efficiency and less on spending more!

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

### **Tell us why:**

Based on what I've seen over the years, I don't trust that what the council's proposal will actually work.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

I would consider getting advice from the Japanese government regarding improving the railway system because they do really know about this.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

I would spend less on big buses, increase frequency with smaller buses or vans for some more remote areas.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### **Tell us why:**

Do not waste money. It is fine as it is. It is not 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



**#3622**



**Tell us why:**

Because it will be more efficient in private hands than in council hands

**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?**

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:**



#3622



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>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 increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#3622



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?**

Reduce council admin costs and that could make a difference in council's budget.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Franklin

**Franklin Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#3622



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.	I don't know
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Do more of reducing costs and spendings

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#3622**



Average. Considering how much money we pay on rates already. Your plan should be more about reducing council spendings, simplify processes and become more efficient.

**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**

Clarks Beach

**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: Franklin

## 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?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop wasting money on pet projects



**#3716**



Stop wasting money on bureaucracy

Spend fuel taxes on roaring not cycling and walking

**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?**

Road maintenance

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings

Bus lanes

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Dosnt get used buy all of Auckland

It is a local area sports field

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



**#3716**



**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?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

No point changing , no one goes to the city any more

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#3716



No point changing , no one goes to the city any more

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>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#3716



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?**

Don't waste money on pet project

Focus on the necessary things that must be done not the nice to have things

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Franklin,Howick

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**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	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#3716



programme, 'Belmont' Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**



#3716



7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

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

Whitford

## 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 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	



#3716



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.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I support all priorities

**Howick Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?**

Fairly Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	Fairly Important
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	Fairly Important
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	Fairly Important
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.	Fairly Important



#3716



Develop a community-led climate action plan.	Fairly Important
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?**

**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: Franklin

## 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	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.



**#3736**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Reasonable

**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:**

As it has low utilisation and attendance, option 3 or even low cost is required. The fund can be used on other parts.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**



**#3736**



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 businesses operate more efficiently.

**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:**

For 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:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#3736



**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>I don't know</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>I don't know</p>



#3736



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?**

No.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**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
--	----------------



#3736



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).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Fair



**#3736**



**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**

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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>	
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<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?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3747**



Food waste rubbish collection. Not needed in our rural area where we already compost most food waste.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Not sure on the dynamic lanes proposal. Hopefully ordinary cars will not end up with little access.

**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, Other

**Tell us why:**

It's a white elephant. Remove the stadium and leave resources for local sports use only.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?**



**#3747**



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:**

There is a dire need to turn the waterfront into a public space that citizens and visitors can enjoy.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



#3747



This option really depends on the vision for the use of this space. Also a decision on the location of a port to serve the needs of importers/exporters and any consequential impact on traffic flows.

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 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>Other</p>



#3747



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths 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.	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?**

If the Council does proceed with the fortnightly Red rubbish bin proposal, the Rubbish collection fee on our rates should consequently HALF!!

Plus in the rural areas of Auckland people compost their food rubbish so do not need a Food Scraps bin. This option to decline this bin and therefore avoid the rates fee for this.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities



#3747



**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.	Fairly Important
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	I don't know
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important



**#3747**



### **Tell us why**

Seems little detail on how the plan affects Waiuku. Past experience with the Franklin Local Board has resulted in areas like Pukekohe getting the major priority.

### **7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

The Waiuku Trails is merely an "Aspirational Plan". The targeted rate proposal suggests a "manager" will be put in place and develop a plan only if the Targeted Rate is agreed to. The plan should be developed into a priority list first so we can then comment on whether we feel it is justified.

### **Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

The plan is too vague on where and when the Local Board would use this funding. eg Waiuku trails plan has been drafted but what priority would the Local Board give this? What if we pay the \$52 per annum but do not get any action on our local trails for se

### **As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Waiuku

### **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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Add additional lanes for main highways to reduce congestion. Provide fast train with limited stops Pukekohe to the airport.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3754**



Base rates on occupants per property and not on property value. Do not add additional cost to pedestrian crossing and leave them as is. Add more roundabouts and remove traffic lights to enable traffic flow thru. Localise council services ie reinstate Pukekohe council so ratepayers benefit from local services. Remove bureaucracy and overhead costs.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Rapid transit network has to happen. Remove pedestrian crossings upgrades and stop cycleways for 5 years then review again.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Rapid transit network

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Pedestrian & cycleways

**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



**#3754**



**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:**



#3754



**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>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>Do not support</p>



#3754



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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

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
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Not Important



#3754



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Not local required need focus on rapid transit from Pukekohe to Auckland airport and to britomart. Stop development of food production land to housing.



**#3754**



**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**

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#3758**



**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:**



#3758



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>	



#3758



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?

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?



**#3759**



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)?**

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:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#3759



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>
<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>



#3759



<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>	
<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>	Do not support
<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



#3759



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

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.	Fairly Important
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).	Not Important



#3759



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**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**

Karaka

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Free up land for housing development but retain the best productive land for food eg bombay Pukekohe but put housing on non productive land eg te hihi, Linwood road , Kingseat



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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	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?

What a loaded question this is. Obviously prepared by outside consultants at a cost to ratepayers. Do more cutting of a bloated workforce that has been growing under previous labour councils. Brown and Goff simply ran with high staff numbers that desperately need to be culled back. Probably 30 - 50% overstaffed. Do time and motion studies on all staff at CCO's and start culling immediately.



**#3807**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less AT spending on dumb raised crossings etc. that cause damage to vehicles and also greater hinder emergency vehicles. Cut bike lanes. Cut CCO's staffing levels by 30% and make them more efficient.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Simply make to existing systems more efficient and once the new rail services are in force and operating them look to what else maybe required. Not add more now until we fix what is broken. In past council has kept adding dumb ideas at huge costs when in fact they simply do not work. This actually stems from having to many dumb arsed staff and payed consultants sitting around on grossly inflated salaries putting up dumb ideas and having even dumber members going along with this and wasting millions of ratepayer dollars in trying to implement these stupid feel good ideas.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

NO

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

YES see above

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Put together a strong operating management team in place with good business minded North Shore people stat can get this place up and running as it should be. Don't let existing council members or staff anywhere near this team - have it totally



**#3807**



independent and let them form a plan. Allocate the 30M to this team to get things up and running to become 100% self funding within 10 years.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

With a track record by all councils this is a dumb idea. It will be spent in a short time and will leave nothing for future generations, just like different funds inherited by incoming councils of this "Super" city and now there is nothing in the bank.

Stop borrowing any further funds for the next 10 years, pay down existing debt with Govt. help if need be. The interest savings alone if invested wisely would create a great future fund in years to come. As long as we can keep councils from putting their hands into the money pot for dumb 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:**

The POAL should be mandated to run efficiently and provide a substantial fund to ACC - this could go into the "Future Fund" same as the airport shares.

The port will be around for a lot longer than 35 years so should stay with Council (ratepayers)

Under previous management the ports company wasted millions and millions of dollars on dumb ideas and it appears under its current leadership they are turning things around and going back to basics in running a port company as such.



**#3807**



**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:**

See above. If it goes to council for council services it will just get frittered away as in the past.

**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:**

Council should be able to generate a better rate of return than the port company for both Capt.Cook and Marsden Wharves. Leave the Bledisloe terminal with Port company for a further 10 years then re-evaluate. It also has to return a return to council

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

See above

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#3807



<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 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>Support</p>



#3807



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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

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.	Not Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Fairly Important



#3807



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Again people in/on council look to spend wily/nily to give themselves a pat on the back and a feel good. Stop this stupid

Adhern type feel good way of thinking.

Look where it has got this country today. Huge debt for every man/woman and child for years



**#3807**



**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Pie in the Sky

**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**

Glenbrook

**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: Franklin

## 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?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#3816**



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:**

Successful profitable stadiums overseas are like that by being used for events every day. reduce cost of hireage to achieve that operate more often for less return maximise usage. Take the accountants out of the decision making 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)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

What is needed is better returns and fiscal management of Auckland assets.

**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



**#3816**



**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:**

It is already too easy for as yet unelected future councils to waste the gains of their predecessors on pet projects that usually of no real benefit to the 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?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

The estimates of proposed possible gains by officials are at best wild guesses they have no idea what future returns may be. The best decisions come from careful consideration the numbers on the table in front of you not guesstimates.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Has more value as cruise ship Hub than the public who only want things for nothing or as long as someone else pays no future for the city in that approach.



#3816



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 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>Do not support</p>



#3816



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Not Important



#3816



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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?**

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#3816**



This proposal is nothing more than a subsidy for users we need a user pay approach. All our parks and walkways should be on a user pay basis. This is the only fair way to recover costs to maintain these assets. NZ threw out the subsidy system for Farmers in t

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Ardmore

**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: Franklin

## 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?

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?



**#3822**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

sounds reasonable for now with budget restraints.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It needs to be used more effectively for 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:**

Am okay with the Auckland Future Fund but do not want all the AIAL 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



**#3822**



**Tell us here:**

Leasing the port will obviously help with funding Auckland's needs but I do not want the port sold or moved.

**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:**

It doesn't cause impact on port activities or value of port.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

it is needed for the port to operate efficiently.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#3822



<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>Support</p>



#3822



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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**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
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Fairly Important



#3822



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (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.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Community relations are vitally important. I do not support the removal of rubbish bins. They are hard enough for some people to find now!

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#3822**



**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**

Beachlands

**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: Franklin

## 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>	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?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

You should make sure you fund or subsidise events that are popular enough and hit the minimum threshold of participants.



**#3836**



This means you need to be able to accurately estimate or count the number of people coming to and event

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Seems that option 1 gives the best return.

However, I think Auckland Council should have some of control or a way to influence whether things go wrong with the management of Port of Auckland by an external entity.

Not sure about AIAL, but as this is a strategic asset for NZ, we need to make sure it doesn't go to the wrong hands. i.e. foreign investors who really don't put NZ as their priority but are looking just after the money.

### **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:**



**#3836**



Seems like a sustainable future solution

**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 this option is the most attractive one regarding future income, and as long as Auckland Council can retain ownership and still have a say and to help progress the council's ownership objectives for the port, I would go ahead 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?**

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



#3836



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>	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



#3836



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths 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.	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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

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	Very Important
---	----------------



#3836



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#3836**



Overall it looks good.

**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**

Beachlands

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#3862**



**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?**

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:**



#3862



**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



#3862



<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>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>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>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>



#3862



6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

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
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important



#3862



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know
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?**

Cannot see anything for Waiuku ???

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Another extra , unacceptable

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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?

The council has never spent enough money on infrastructure, they always seem more interested in getting voted in by keeping a cap on rates.



**#3866**



Its about time we woke up from our dream world and truly addressed what is necessary. We keep on increasing our population without replacing or Increasing things such as water, sewage, power, roading, etc.

A big increase in rates in the short term and a reduction in wasteful spending.

Ervery council department needs to be much more financially accountable for wasteful spending.

**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:**

It's all about reducing hold ups in the flow of traffic

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

The whole idea of Road cones being in place with speed limits 24 hours a day when there is no work going and no need for the speed reduction, is very frustrating to the average driver.

Better more realistic controls are needed, which will probably be more expensive.

**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:**



**#3866**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

Overdue

**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:**

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



#3866



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 we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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



#3866



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.	Support
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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#3866



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
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Fairly Important



**#3866**



**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Fairly good and needed for growth.

Renaming of places from English to Maori is a big waste of money and could be much better spent on real issues.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Stop wasting so much of our money with speed cameras

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
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?

More indoor sports facilities for all levels and sports.

Fix water pollution in our harbours

More attention to outter regions neglected for too long



**#3896**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less spent on consultants, feasibility studies and costly red tape when it come to local government projects.

Be reasonable when it comes to providing resources. Consult with community, private partners and work in servant leadership for positive outcomes that are tailored to the diverse communities. Only being research based without consulting our communities is costly and problematic.

**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?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Our community doesn't have a stadium so that would be nice.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



**#3896**



**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:**

**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:**



#3896



**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 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>Do not support</p>



#3896



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?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

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
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that	Very Important



#3896



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.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Very Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	I don't know
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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not 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.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

Franklin area with it’s massive growth projections require significant investment in community services

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#3896**



Not very inspired or forward thinking. Lacks evidence of significant investment and most of these, while I support them, are easily forgotten if more important things come along.

We are already missing 3m of community funding for upgrading facilities that was never returned due to covid.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

We don't need paths, we need investment in our facilities.

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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 just use what you have properly - apply good economic rational and maximises utility. Not the frivolous wastage I have seen when I worked for a CCO.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3909



Yes all the woke nonsense. Why am I paying for this food scraps bin? This is ridiculous. Why all the woke stuff? Why arts funding that only a very small minority benefit from? put this money into mass capture activities like parks where kids can play basketball etc

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

MRT is a better investment than cycle lanes - again an exuberant amount of money disproportionately spent to appease a few cyclists. Look at Mangere - how much money spent there and for what?

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No again use what you have with more responsibility - spend money as if it was your own.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Consultation - the amount wasted in consultation (and local boards holding stuff up when they know next to nothing about anything) is a major frustration.

## 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)?



**#3909**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**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?**

I don't know



#3909



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>	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	Do not support



#3909



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?**

cut funding to local boards and democracy services that support them, get rid of all the nonsense workshops that you pay people a lot for and get no output, and reign in councilors, a group of self important people who ultimately contribute nothing.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Franklin,Manurewa,Papakura

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**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	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#3909



programme, 'Belmont' Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Not Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**



#3909



7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

transport and infrastructure

Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?

dont want it

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Pukekohe

## Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Strengthen partnerships with local mana whenua through project delivery, including Te Kete Rukuruku, completion of David Lange Park playground and improvements.	
Deliver community climate initiatives such as Low Carbon Lifestyles, and Māngere Bike Hub with our community partners.	
Deliver a community-driven safety action plan aimed at tackling anti-social behaviour and addressing local safety concerns enhancing the overall sense of safety within our local community.	
Improve employment and economic opportunities through our local economic broker programme.	



#3909



Support community-led activations at our parks and facilities through our community grants.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I do not support any priorities

Manurewa Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Manurewa in 2024/2025?

Fairly Important

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.	Fairly Important
Invest in evidence-based projects that focus on crime prevention, safer communities and injury prevention.	Not Important
Fund and support activities that include older people and foster their community participation with a specific focus on reaching older migrants.	Not Important
Invest in community led projects and initiatives that respond to social connection and cohesion, build climate resilience and contribute to climate action.	Not Important



#3909



Develop a masterplan for Mountfort Park to ensure our open space and sports field network meets the demands of our diverse communities.	Not Important
Identify options for recreational activities to support people of all ages and abilities being casually active.	Not Important
Investigate community lease options to support Ngāti Tamaoho aspirations for a cultural hub at Te Pua/Keith Park.	Not Important
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?**

**Papakura Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Papakura in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.	Not Important
We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga	Not Important



#3909



Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.	
We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.	Not Important
We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.	Not Important
Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Papakura proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Be responsible with rate payer money - maximise utility by sticking to the basics right now. None of the aspirational or woke stuff 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: Franklin

## 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>	Do more
<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?

provide free at least 1 annual dump pass for disposal of rubbish to reduce fly-tipping.

mow the sides of the roads in rural areas at least twice a year.

have a team work on eradication on noxious weeds along country road sides.



**#3914**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

eliminate funding of cultural and special interest events, light shows, fireworks displays and all other non core ratepayer centric activities,

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

widen arterial routes or eliminate parking on arterial routes, to create bus lanes so that bus stops are not positioned in the normal traffic lane.

allow bicycles and e-scooters to share the same space, seperate from cars and pedestrian space, regularly maintain and sweep the bicycle/e-scooter lanes.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

widen arterial routes or eliminate parking on arterial routes, to create bus lanes so that bus stops are not positioned in the normal traffic lane.

allow bicycles and e-scooters to share the same space, seperate from cars and pedestrian space, regularly maintain and sweep the bicycle/e-scooter lanes.

**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)?**



**#3914**



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:**

**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:**

turn captain cook and marsden into dedicated cruise ship terminal

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#3914



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Bledisloe Terminal site is basically transit area for car imports, move this operation to Marsden Point.

**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>



#3914



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.	Support
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?**

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#3914



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
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important



**#3914**



**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

DONT FORGET WHITFORD BEACHLANDS AND MARAETAI

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Whitford

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

DONT FORGET WHITFORD, BEACHLANDS AND MARAETAI



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?

Look for alternative income rather than increasing rate

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Decrease your management level so that that money can be used somewhere else



**#3928**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Because public transport always empty

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**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:**

The stadium is ok the way 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)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#3928



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	Do not support
---	----------------



#3928



<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>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>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>	



#3928



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.

**6b. Do you have 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

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**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.	Fairly Important
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	Fairly Important



#3928



board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Fairly Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Fairly 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?**

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Plant shrubs instead of bushy plants by the path



**#3928**



**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?**

When cost of living is going up I think this is the time for council to help us instead taking more money from us



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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. Do much less. Auckland Council should be slashed to a tiny organisation doing very little. Auckland Council does nothing of value, it's simply a parasite on Aucklanders making all of our lives worse.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#3967**



Auckland Council does nothing of any value - it should be disbanded completely.

While the council still exists it should do much less, don't get involved in roads or transport cultural woke nonsense, parks, urban "improvements". Auckland council is toxic - so do less as that will reduce the toxicity.

Disband AT. All councillors & the mayor should be paid nothing and no expenses paid.

Do less of everything, in fact do nothing would be better.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Auckland Council should not be involved in any transport issues - AT is corrupt & should be shut down. Auckland Council hates Aucklanders and obviously wants to ban movement around the city as part of your disgusting C40 Cities agenda.

Auckland Council should stop getting involved in any decisions or activities - the less involvement in Aucklanders lives the better.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No. Nothing at all.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Spend much less on everything.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

### **Tell us why:**

The stadium should be sold off and the money given back to taxpayers.



**#3967**



There's no need for the council to be involved in any stadium, what a waste of our 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)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Sell all shares & investments - Auckland Council should not have any investments, stop wasting our money, sell all of the shares and give the money back to the taxpayers.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Sell all of the port properties and shares - the money should be given back to the taxpayers. Stop wasting taxpayers money on investments.

**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 should not be making any investments - it's obvious your stealing taxpayers money and giving out to your corrupt cronies in the investment sector.

Sell all investments and give the money back to the taxpayers.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#3967



**Tell us here:**

Scrap the future investment fund, stop getting involved in all of these investment activities with your corrupt cronies, stop wasting our money. Sell all shares & property owned by the council.

The only thing the council should do is collect rubbish - everything else is pointless and corrupt. 99% of Auckland Council's activities and employees should be scrapped.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Sell all port land and shares - give all of the money raised back to the taxpayers.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Sell it and give the money back to taxpayers.

**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>



#3967



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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.	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.	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.	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.	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?**



#3967



Auckland Council needs to do the following : stop spending money. Any shortfalls in budgets should mean activities stop and staff are fired. The only thing that matters is reducing spending and reducing budgets.

Auckland Council is a force for evil, it needs to be slashed until eventually it's totally disbanded.

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Franklin

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place	Not Important



#3967



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

All of Franklin local boards "priorities" are wrong. Stop wasting our money, you're all corrupt. Auckland Council and Franklin local board do nothing of any value or importance in Franklin so just sack all employees, do not pay even 1 cent in salary or ex

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Terrible.

None of Franklin's priorities match what people in Franklin care about - please shut down all council activities and stop spending our money.

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**



**#3967**



Stop wasting our money, stop stealing our money and giving it to your cronies in corrupt contracts and tenders - we can all see the corruption you're involved in.

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Waiuku

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Stop wasting our money.

Disband AT.

Disband Auckland Council.

Stop spending all money.

Sack all Auckland council staff.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?

Drop selective cultural spending. There are more than 3 cultures in Auckland (maori, chinese and indian)



**#3982**



**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:**



#3982



**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 increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#3982



<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>	<p>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>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>



#3982



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

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**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
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place	Not Important



#3982



naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).	
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly 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.	Very Important
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**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**

Waiuku

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4009**



**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:**



#4009



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>	



#4009



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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4012**



**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:**



#4012



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>	



#4012



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4016**



**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:**



#4016



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>	



#4016



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: Franklin

## 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 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?



**#4018**



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:**



#4018



**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



#4018



<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>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>



**#4018**



**6b. Do you have 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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4029**



**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:**



#4029



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>	



#4029



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?

No.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#4036**



Sack half of the useless lot at A.T. This would have to be the most incompetent bunch of idiots to ever call themselves public servants.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Stop wasting money on rubbish like more cycle ways and carbon reduction vehicles.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Infrastructure maintenance.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

A.T. salaries, cycle ways, speed cameras,

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Chose which ever option costs the least.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

Putting funding in place for the future needs of Aucklanders is a good idea.



**#4036**



**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 above.

**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:**

As above.

**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:**

Proceed as long as returns from the wharves is better then what council currently gets from ports of Auckland now and considering the \$110,000,000.00 cost of the Bledisloe terminal.



#4036



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Costs of change, reduced income, loss of port facilities, etc.

**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.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support



#4036



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?**

No

## 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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4039**



**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:**



#4039



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>	



#4039



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4042**



**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:**



#4042



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>	



#4042



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.	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: Franklin

## 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	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?



**#4055**



**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:**



#4055



**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.	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



#4055



<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>	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>	Support
<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



#4055



6b. Do you have 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, Hibiscus and Bays

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

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
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important



#4055



Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Fairly 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.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**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**

Karaka

**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?**



#4055



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.	
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?**

Not Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#4055



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.	Fairly 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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4077**



Yes, stop building cycle ways that no one uses, no more speed bumps, no more wasteful spending on 'pet projects' Auckland has had enough

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

You dont really care what we say. lets face it

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

consultancy fees - if you need to outsource your work, then your in the wrong job. Why should we pay twice for one job

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Way waste more money, the stadium is fine 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:**



**#4077**



**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:**

Lease it, and use the money to reduce 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:**

Wasteful spending

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#4077



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 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>



#4077



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.	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?**

Stop wasting rate payers money. Why should I pay for other peoples water and sewage, when I catch my own water and have a sewage tank. Does this mean if I run out of water, or need to empty the tank, will it be paid for by the rates payers.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

STOP WASTING RATE PAYERS MONEY ON PET PROJECTS.. AUCKLAND IS SICK OF IT.. there is no such thing as climate crisis. and stop forcing woke ideas and trans or gay down our throats.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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 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?

More Road upgrades for cars. Widen Urban Routes. Complete CRL, and existing Busway routes, as long as they aren’t using existing car transport infrastructure.



**#4082**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less speed humps and ridiculous raised pedestrian crossings that are congesting Urban Central routes, increasing emissions, which is more harmful to the environment, and creates more wear/tear on vehicles. Open up urban routes so traffic can flow.

Terminate the Food Scrap Bin - Absolute waste of rate payers money.

Remove T2/T3 lanes, and build separate busway routes.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Because they are counter productive and don't serve Aucklanders main commute option: Car

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Second Harbour bridge crossing for Vehicles, widen Hwy 1 from Nikau rd to Drury North Bound initially. Get Hwy 1 built from Warkworth to Wellsford.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Food Scrap bins

Raised pedestrian crossings

Speed bumps

T2/3 lanes

Bus lanes using car lanes in urban/main routes.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is



**#4082**



**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:**

Move the Port to Whangarei

**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



#4082



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>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>



#4082



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.	Support
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?

Franklin

## Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#4082



**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
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 Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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.	Not Important



**#4082**



**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**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**

Pukekohe

**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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4095**



**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:**



#4095



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>	



#4095



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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4096**



**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:**



#4096



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>	



#4096



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.	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: Franklin

## 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 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?

Give us back Franklin council so we can get out of this stupid super city.

Living in Pukekohe we get nothing for the rates we pay

We dont even have a proper transport system to help with the growth of traffic



**#4097**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Give us back Franklin council so we can get out of this stupid super city.

Living in Pukekohe we get nothing for the rates we pay.

We dont even have a proper transport system to help with the growth of traffic

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We dont even have a proper transport system to help with the growth of traffic

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

We dont even have a proper transport system to help with the growth of traffic

We need more Ambulances

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Dole bludgers

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

why would auckland tax payer money go into this project when theres no decent public transport system in place



**#4097**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:**

GET A TRAIN SYSTEM IN PLACE FIRST

**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:**

There's not enough money spent evenly throughout all councils. Most money invested in the city which benefits no one living out south

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Give franklin back its independency we dont want to be part of the super city

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#4097



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

waste of 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?**

<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>



#4097



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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.	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.	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?**

FRANKLIN CAN NOT EVEN GET RUBBISH BINS AS PART OF OUR RATES..  
PLEASE TELL ME WHY

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Franklin



#4097



## Franklin Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

#### 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.	Not Important
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.	Not Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuuanuku (environmental restoration).	Not Important
Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Not 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



#4097



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**

GIVE US RUBBISH BINS

**7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

WE NEED RUBBISH BINS AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?**

Waste of money

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Pukekohe

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

RUBBISH BINS PER HOUSEHOLD

everyone else gets bins, we DONT



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Franklin

## 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?



**#4098**



**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:**



#4098



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>	



#4098



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4100**



**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:**



#4100



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>	



#4100



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4101**



**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:**



#4101



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>	



#4101



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4102**



**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:**



#4102



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>	



#4102



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.	Other
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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4103**



**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:**



#4103



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>	



#4103



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4106**



**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:**



#4106



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>	



#4106



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4107**



**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:**



#4107



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>	



#4107



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.	Other
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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4108**



**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:**



#4108



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>	



#4108



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4111**



**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:**



#4111



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>	



#4111



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4113**



**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:**



#4113



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>	



#4113



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4115**



**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:**



#4115



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>	



#4115



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4116**



**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:**



#4116



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>	



#4116



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4119**



**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:**



#4119



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>	



#4119



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4121**



**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:**



#4121



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>	



#4121



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.	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: Franklin

## 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?



**#4122**



**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:**



#4122



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>	



#4122



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.	Other
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?