



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

Written Feedback

Henderson-Massey Volume #4

April 2024



| Sub # | Organisation Name | Page Number |
|--------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| 15235 | Waitakere Chinese Association | 488 |
| 15324 | Aushiu Shed | 531 |
| 15668 | Te Pou Theatre | 725 |



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14893



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14893



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14893



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



#14893



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

I don’t know

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

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

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

n/a

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



#14902



not a fan of adding more bus stops when they are not needed. when having 2 lanes and then turning one of them into a bus lane causes more traffic

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

sometimes creates too much traffic when turning into a lane into a bus lane

2a. Is there anything you 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?

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



#14902



Tell us 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?

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>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.</p> | |
|---|--|



#14902



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



#14902



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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14906



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14906



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14906



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



#14906



Local board priorities

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

Franklin,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#14907



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Awesome strategy plans allowing me to save the vision (long term)

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

No need for long changes, the stadium is doing well by itself right now.

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

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

Tell us why:

Wasting money on things that aren't considered priority to me

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

I don't know

Tell us here:



#14907



not too fussed about this protocol as it doesn't offend a effect a mass amount of people right now. Bigger things to worry about.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Keep it as it is!!

4d. Do you have 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:

Keep it as it is

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



#14907



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



#14907



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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |



#14907



| | |
|--|--|
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | there are some good proposals but at my age a lot of things don't faze me. |

Tell us why

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Our community's and transport

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



#14912



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Safe travelling

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Other

Tell us why:

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



#14912



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:

For rugby

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



#14912



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



#14912



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?

Start charging less for petrol and putting the prices down for groceries



#14914



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

transport is important to me but not everything that doesn't need that extra money

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

I would spend more on pedestrian crossings especially near school areas.

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:

Never knew there was a north harbour 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:

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

Other

Tell us here:



#14914



Not very interested in the ports of auckland

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

Same answer as 4b

4d. Do you have 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 would be good to have more attractions in the CBD to look at instead of just ports, wharves and shipment

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

Other

Tell us why:

This is a hit or miss opportunity

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#14914



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



#14914



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Other |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 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?

Healthcare, education, public facilities

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

Large events can be selectively reduced.



#14917



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?

Tell us why:

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



#14917



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#14917



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>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.</p> | Support |



#14917



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14920



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

I agree with all statements

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#14920



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 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.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#14920



| | |
|---|--------------|
| residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?



#14920



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14925



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14925



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14925



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



#14925



Local board priorities

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

Franklin,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14927



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

safer roads, less congestion

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

fixing roads

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

speed bumps in unnecessary places

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:



#14927



will have money to invest into 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?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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.

I don't know



#14927



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



#14927



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14930



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14930



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14930



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



#14930



Local board priorities

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

Franklin,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

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

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?



#14932



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 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:



#14932



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Do not support |



#14932

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#14932



6b. Do you have 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 Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14939



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14939



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14939



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



#14939



Franklin Local Boards Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | As proposed |

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14946



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because they have some valid points, but the time frame is very long

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

Petrol prices for sure

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:

Saves time and money as there are other things that are more important to focus on a priority

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Because I believe it is a good cause to make life easier for everyone, plus provide more affordable lifestyles.

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



#14946



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:

More suitable and efficient to not have to start a whole new thing

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:

Use the funds for beneficial purpose for the next generation

4d. Do you have 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 benefits the public community and people of all ages to come together as a collective community

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#14946



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



#14946



| | |
|---|----------------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14947



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:

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



#14947



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14947



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

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support



#14947



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

I don’t know

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| 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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14951



I don't know

Tell us why:

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

Families in need

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

tax

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:

waterfront stadium



#14951



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:

More high riases

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

New beach

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

I don't know



#14951



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



#14951



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?

waterfront stadium

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |



#14951



Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.

Basketball courts on Barry's

Tell us why

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14952



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?



#14952



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14952



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



#14952



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14956



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?



#14956



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14956



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



#14956



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?

A community service centre in Henderson that provides a venue for local and foreign residents to have activities

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



#14959



More economic development, and reduce the burden of increasing costs for the people

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

If the public feedback is strong, then yes

2a. Is there anything you 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



#14959



Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Do not support



#14959



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



#14959



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,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14962



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14962



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14962



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



#14962



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?



#14966



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14966



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14966



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



#14966



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14968



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14968



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14968



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



#14968



Local board priorities

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

Franklin,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal



#14970



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#14970



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14970



| | |
|---|--------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support



#14970



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal



#14971



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#14971



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14971



| | |
|---|---------|
| residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?



#14971



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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14972



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14972



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14972



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



#14972



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#14976



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14976



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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14976



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



#14976



Local board priorities

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

Franklin,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?



#14977



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14977



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14977



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



#14977



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14978



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?



#14978



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14978



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



#14978



Local board priorities

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

Franklin,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14980



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?



#14980



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14980



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



#14980



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?



#14983



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14983



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14983



| | |
|---|---------|
| residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?



#14983



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14986



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14986



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14986



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



#14986



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14990



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14990



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14990



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



#14990



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14993



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14993



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14993



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



#14993



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#14995



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#14995



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#14995



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



#14995



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15000



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?



#15000



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15000



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



#15000



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15003



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15003



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15003



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



#15003



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15004



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15004



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15004



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



#15004



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?



#15009



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15009



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15009



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



#15009



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | |
| Water | Do more |
| 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?

Flood control, road maintenance, repair of damaged areas, these will be severely damaged one day when an external incident happens

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



#15010



Make payments transparent, so we have a say in whether they are reasonable or not

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?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

There are no community facilities in the main area

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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:



#15010



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 Port operations remain unchanged.

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



#15010



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



#15010



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,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | As proposed |

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

more ethnic and diverse cultural activity

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

smaller buses during off peak hours



#15011



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Decision makers don't know what they doing.

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

Support diversity and culture of migrants.

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

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

Tell us why:

keep for the future generation.

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



#15011



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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#15011



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



#15011



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Do not Support.

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |



#15011



| | |
|--|---|
| 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. | ***** waste of our money. Most are useless decision makers. |

Tell us why

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

8. Do you have any other comments?

Stop wasting our money for stupid proposals.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15015



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15015



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15015



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



#15015



Local board priorities

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

Franklin,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do 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?



#15016



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15016



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15016



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



#15016



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15017



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15017



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15017



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



#15017



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | |

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

Medical care, hospital services and other public facilities, stormwater management, Public transportation,

#Henderson Massey provides a large community events for people to attend. To ensure the ethnic minority groups have fixed venue for activities



#15019



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

events, Large public facilities and infrastructure.

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?

Providing more community venues to provide more stable times for club activities.

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:

It can increase revenue, reduce unnecessary waste, and redevelopment 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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



#15019



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



#15019



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



#15019



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,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15022



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15022



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15022



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



#15022



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?



#15026



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15026



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15026



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



#15026



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 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?

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15027



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#15027



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Do not support |



#15027

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Other</p> |



#15027



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15031



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15031



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15031



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



#15031



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15033



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)?

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 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 support the port of Auckland being owned by the people of Auckland

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#15033



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#15033



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15033



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15036



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#15036



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15036



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



#15036



Local board priorities

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

Franklin,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15037



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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:



#15037



4d. Do you have 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:

Port of Auckland should continue as it is, it is working well and the profits go back to all Auckland people.

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |



#15037



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>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.</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?



#15037



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: Henderson-Massey

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal



#15041



Tell us why:

Fewer bike lanes

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

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

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

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?



#15041



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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15041



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



#15041



Local board priorities

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

Franklin,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | |
| 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?

1d. Is there anything else 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



#15047



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15047



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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15047



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



#15047



Local board priorities

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

Franklin,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15048



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)?

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:

Port of Auckland belongs to the Auckland people. All profits from POAL should go back to Aucklanders and not off shore!!

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



#15048



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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | |



#15048



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>from what 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>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.</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?



#15048



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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15053



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

Selling the port operations would end up costing the people of Auckland 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:



#15053



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15053



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15054



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

Port of Auckland is a strategic long term asset for Auckland, let's keep it under our control

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#15054



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#15054



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15054



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | |
| 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?

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15056



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#15056



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15056



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



#15056



Local board priorities

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

Franklin,Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15060



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

As a port of Auckland worker I want the port to stay in local ownership not privatized.

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:



#15060



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15060



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15061



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

Keep our port public - keep it owned by Aucklanders

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:



#15061



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15061



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15065



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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:



#15065



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

Tell us here:

Keep the port. Cost of living is high as is. Any changes could sky rocket price of goods.

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



#15065



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15068



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15068



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15068



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



#15068



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15074



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

Keep our port public - keep it owned by Aucklanders

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:



#15074



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15074



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?



#15076



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



#15076



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15076



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



#15076



Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15078



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

Koop our port public- keep it owned by 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:



#15078



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15078



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15079



Tell us why:

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

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

I don't support POAL being taken over by an overseas corporation with no commitment 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



#15079



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#15079



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15079



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15082



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Keep our port public- Keep it owned by 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:



#15082



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15082



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15086



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

I support the port of Auckland being owned by the people of Auckland.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#15086



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15086



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15089



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#15089



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15089



| | |
|---|--------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?



#15089



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15091



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?



#15091



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15091



| | |
|---|---------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?



#15091



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15094



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

As a worker of port of Auckland I want the port to stay in local ownership not privatised

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:



#15094



4d. Do you have 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.

Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.



#15094



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>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.</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?



#15094



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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15096



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#15096



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15096



| | |
|---|--------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?



#15096



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15101



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#15101



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15101



| | |
|---|--------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?



#15101



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15105



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?



#15105



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15105



| | |
|---|--------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?



#15105



Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15107



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

I support the port of Auckland being owned by the people of Auckland

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#15107



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15107



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15109



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Saving the port would cost the local people of Auckland more money

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#15109



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15109



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal



#15111



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#15111



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15111



| | |
|---|--------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support



#15111



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15120



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#15120



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15120



| | |
|---|---------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?



#15120



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do 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?

Better healthcare

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15121



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

better traffic

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Fuel

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:

Good to have backup in case of another flood

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:



#15121



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
|---|----------------|



#15121



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#15121



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do 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?

Improved traffic

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15127



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Don't like this new tax idea

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#15127



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:

Insurance for future flooding etc.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#15127



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>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.</p> | I don't know |



#15127



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal



#15128



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#15128



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15128



| | |
|---|--------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?



#15128



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improved traffic, health facilities

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

taxes



#15133



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

No more taxes

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

less traffic

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

taxes

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Waste of money

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#15133



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in | Support |
|---|---------|



#15133



| | |
|---|----------------|
| the protection of native ecosystems 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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |



#15133



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | |
| 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?



#15134



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:

n/a

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

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?

Other



#15134



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Other</p> |



#15134



| | |
|---|-------|
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Other |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Other |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Other |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Other |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Other |
| 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. | 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?



#15134



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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15137



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#15137



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15137



| | |
|---|--------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?



#15137



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Invest more toward police/health services

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

taxes



#15142



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Don't support this new tax suggestion

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Improve traffic

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

taxes

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



#15142



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#15142



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#15142



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improve health facilities

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Want to pay less tax



#15152



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

No taxes

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Taxes

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:

Be good incase we have another big disaster

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:



#15152



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:

This place provides work for many families

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



#15152



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#15152



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15153



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#15153



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15153



| | |
|---|---------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?



#15153



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15161



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#15161



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in | Do not support |



#15161



| | |
|--|---------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>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.</p> | Support |



#15161



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15162



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Port of Auckland is a strategic long term asset for Auckland, let's keep it under our control

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services



#15162



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#15162



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15162



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improve traffic management, invest in access facilities, and flood and waterlogging prevention facilities.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15167



Fewer large events

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

increase the construction of communication links and reduce bicycle areas, because investing in large-scale bicycle communication has little effect.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Reduce spending on bike passes proposals.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Change the operation of the stadium to ensure that the community can make greater use of the venue, especially the need to vigorously support ethnic minority communities to use the venue.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#15167



The establishment of the Auckland future fund is beneficial to the development of Auckland.

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:

Port of Auckland business needs to be maintained.

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



#15167



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15167



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?

Less tax



#15169



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Everything is being taxed. need less taxes

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

taxes

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Waste of money to redevelop, should try to find better ways to utilize that space and
Fill seats

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?



#15169



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:

Should plan something similar for harbour stadium

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:

Don't want a lot of people to lose their jobs



#15169



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#15169



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15172



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#15172



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15172



| | |
|---|---------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?



#15172



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?

Do more for our environment and parks and safer communities get street lights etc.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15181



Levels for fuel tax and living costs

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Would love to stop AKL traffic

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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:



#15181



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:

Both continue fund council services and invest in AFF

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Does this plan actually get carried out?

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 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.</p> | |
|---|--|



#15181



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>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</p> | |



#15181



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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15183



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Keep our port public - keep it owned by Aucklanders

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:



#15183



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15183



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15190



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

As a worker at the port I want the port to stay in local ownership and not make it privatized

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



#15190



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#15190



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15190



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | Do less |
| 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?

More economic development

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Pay less land tax



#15191



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 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:



#15191



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#15191



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>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.</p> | Support |



#15191



6b. Do you have 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 Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?

Proposed councilor salary reduction and city council staff budget.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15197



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:



#15197



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 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.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#15197



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | I don't know |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I believe we are not in the right govt space to be making car charges for Aucklanders

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15208



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I would need a full transparency plan to support this fully

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Get more people in by community engagement - don't waste money redeveloping

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

Tell us why:

This is a god plan, just wary it wont trickle down to the ones who need it most

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:



#15208



This will be good for the proposed time

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:

Would be good for community to utilize it

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



#15208



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |



#15208



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15215



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Overseas ownership will take control of the port and profits away from Auckland people

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



#15215



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#15215



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15215



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do 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?

More input and support for small businesses

More for our environment in AKL

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less on taxing



#15234



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Mostly support but do wonder how this money will affect us in 10 years

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Faster road workers - repairs

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:

Solution for the upcoming climate change events. No need to rush if it occurs often

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know



#15234



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#15234



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#15234



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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I trust our board to do the right thing for all. They are very competent leaders in the henderson massey area. |



#15234



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Waitakere Chinese Association

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?

Develop the economy more, let the economy prosper, and Chinese American businessman in Henderson need a community center to serve immigrants.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15235



fees and reduce the burden on my old classmates.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Buildings in necessary. It can be done; it doesn't cost too much shipping cost, and it costs the person's 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?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

Tell us why:

Selected both proceed with proposal and I don't know.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#15235



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 **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Do not support



#15235



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | Support |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |



#15235



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?

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?

Proposed to reduce the city council's artificial budget and reduce the price of petrol and food.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15262



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?



#15262



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?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Other</p> |



#15262



| | |
|---|-------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Other |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Other |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Other |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Other |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Other |
| 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. | 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?



#15262



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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do 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?

More free community based events, and support

Making suburbs safe for youth to be active

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

less on center suburbs / suburbs who already have facilities



#15263



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Support for better pollution numbers but weary of the costs in parking/car tickets and fines

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Paying road works more for a faster job to avoid traffic

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

The money could be put towards leaving poverty, north shore has plenty of facilities to use

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

important to have a fund for client resilience

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#15263



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:

Spilt for both? good to be proactive but also can be used for community use

4d. Do you have 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 **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



#15263



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#15263



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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | as long as the board commits to fulfilling these im happy |



#15263



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | 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?

-



#15277



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?

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?

Other

Tell us here:



#15277



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?

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 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.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
|---|--------------|



#15277



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Other</p> |



#15277



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: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | 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 train repairs for school and better parks

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Maybe let us pay less for auckland transport students



#15285



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Better to get to school on time

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

free transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Delays and repairs

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:

would be nice for families affected by the floods

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know



#15285



Tell us 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?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in | |



#15285



| | |
|--|--|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | |



#15285



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | Will be cool for all people in the community to receive more free events |

Tell us why



#15285



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do 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 for community benefit

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less for economic business benefit



#15298



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Less traffic is good

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

reduced pollution

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

roadworks

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Why is north shore a big chunk of this plan?

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Think an insurance for AKL no matter what natural disasters occur in good as long as it trickles down

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#15298



I don't know

Tell us here:

How will this affect al the young pacific workers at the port

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

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

Support



#15298



| | |
|---|--------------|
| increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |



#15298



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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |



#15298



| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | community benefit is great |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

better healthcare system, less traffic

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

taxes. useless traffic system (speed bumped traffic lights)



#15310



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

get rid of speedbumped traffic lights

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

get rid of speedbumped traffic lights

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Putting speedbumps @ traffic lights

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Utilize space for better income flow

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?



#15310



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in | Support |
|---|---------|



#15310



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | Support |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |



#15310



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improved traffic

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

taxes



#15314



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Less tax :)

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Less traffic

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

less tax

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:

Waste of money

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#15314



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in | Support |
|---|---------|



#15314



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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 Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | Support |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |



#15314



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Aushiu Shed

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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 | 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?

i'd like to see real changes in the communities that really need it due to the fact other areas are more financially more ahead than others.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

The costs of living in general due to high costs of living kids can't go to school for school trying to help with parents



#15324



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

because its needed

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

bills

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

less taxes

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:



#15324



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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |



#15324



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>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.</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?



#15324



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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

better, more efficient healthcare

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

taxes



#15333



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

one less tax sound good to me

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

improved traffic

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#15333



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#15333



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#15333



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?

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

Infrastructure hasn't been maintained for stormwater. Just a comment. I'm not entirely convinced that our rates are being allocated correctly

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15339



Charging for food waste on rates

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

You're passing transport costs to those who need cars because public transport is so poor. How do I get to the airport from west? How do I get to the North Shore in under an hour?

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Road quality is shocking. Improve roads

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Introducing new speed limits, they slow down everything. The cap on public transport is ridiculous

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It can be utilized better and open it to more activities

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#15339



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

The port provides significant employment opportunities to Aucklanders. Moving or leasing out the port could mean that costs increase for freight and customs

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:

I don't believe leasing the port out will give the council the desired effect. Remembering the work that has gone into Union and POAL relationships. We don't see industrial action as often as privatized companies.

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:



#15339



The port is delivering and giving back to the council and rate payers. It creates significant employment opportunities and reduces costs for freight companies than having a port further away

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

I don't think what the council are proposing will have the desired effect

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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. | Support |



#15339



| | |
|---|----------------|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Fund more Pacifica community hubs, networks, academics etc for your insights and engagement

also to put money towards maori development

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15340



What is the point of restructuring the north shore stadium? The money would go to communities in need.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Agree with faster and reliable transport but disagree that parking fines etc.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

faster reliable trains system

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Repairing just build it properly in the first place

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

The money could be used else where for communities that need it more

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

important for future events in a client crisis - How will the money get to the right community though?



#15340



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

I'm either option - i just know many Pacifica youth work at the ports - how would it affect them?

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?



#15340



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#15340



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local | |



#15340



| | |
|--|--|
| 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

I support the amount of priorities but would like to see more in the future of Pacifica/Maori priorates

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15342



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?



#15342



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#15342



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?



#15342



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do 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?

efficient healthcare, less traffic

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

taxes



#15345



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I like the idea to remove tax

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

improved traffic

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

tax

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



#15345



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#15345



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#15345



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?

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I'm all for paying more if it means more for the less fortunate are able to get basic living standards for practices. less money on the rich and more on youth in need.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15354



Less road workers unless needed

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

better for our tamankei to stop

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Community engagement for a solutions to a lesser used stadium

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

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



#15354



Tell us here:

better for nz's jobs

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:

agree with both invest and council services

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

More Pacifica's youth focus next time

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?



#15354



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#15354



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15357



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

I support the port of Auckland being owned by Aucklanders

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:



#15357



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15357



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Environmental protection

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15363



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I want transport to be faster

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

AT transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Gas

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)?

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?



#15363



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | |



#15363



| | |
|---|--|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15363



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Add more bus service to decrease time gaps, less apartment complex to reduce traffic, homeless shelters should be installed locally

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15367



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:



#15367



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15367



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15371



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Port of Auckland should stay as it is, its working well and profits are going back to Aucklanders

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services



#15371



Tell us here:

Making good money to help the economy

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | |



#15371



| | |
|---|--|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15371



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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?

Pay more for none money

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

pay less to the best option. already struggling as it is



#15372



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Would be good in theory but would rather make fuel cheaper

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

\$\$ for less traffic

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

fuel tax

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:



#15372



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:

be good to actually use 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

I don't know



#15372



| | |
|---|--------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | I don't know |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | I don't know |



#15372



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?

More funding on current living costs



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do 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?

The money going in pay more will hopefully help those most in need and support

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15377



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Faster and reliable transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

less fuel tax

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Why waste money? get people to use it more

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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:



#15377



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:

More pacific focus next plan

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



#15377



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#15377



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| 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?

be good for services for students to get jobs etc. Easier - hard for us to make money

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less taxes? if im under 18 and can't vote why do i pay tax



#15382



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

be nice to get to school / work with no delays

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#15382



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15382



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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 | |
| 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?

no more rates get the government to pay their share. Why is the only option for rate payer to pay more. not fair. more government to help Auckland.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15394



Get government to pay their share. Why is the only option for rate payer to pay more. council should spend more wisely.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Make the government pay there share.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Transport better spending on trans and buses not more roads with more cars on them.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Less council people who don't know what they are doing experience needed.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Keep the green spaces we have and the public green spaces stay the same we need 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:



#15394



Fund could disappear with future councils. do not sell the airport shares. no to future funds could change with future government.

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 sell the part of Auckland it belongs to the people from 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:

no future fund who knows when that will be spent and when Auckland do not know this has happened.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

We as Aucklanders need to keep our assets do not sell them wait until the tourist ships come to Auckland port. profit for Auckland.

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:

Make money on Auckland asset leave them alone. They belong to Auckland.



#15394



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Don't change our ports they belong to Auckland get the money from the government.

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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Other |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Other |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |



#15394



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Other |
| 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?

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Other

Make it fair for all council

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

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?



#15394



| | |
|--|---|
| 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. | Given the local travel a fair share of the funding why should the west get less funding than the other areas not fair get it right. |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Why should Howick get more than west Auckland fund each area with the same funding why should poorer areas get less money. Not a fair process. Make it fair for all areas. not just rich areas getting more the same for all areas.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

i dont know

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

i don,t know



#15407



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?

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:



#15407



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:

no

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | I don't know |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | I don't know |



#15407

| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | I don't know |
| <p>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.</p> | I don't know |



#15407



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

Don't have anything to say



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More parks, Reserves

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15408



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Roads

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?

Tell us here:



#15408



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. | I don't know |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#15408



| | |
|---|--------------|
| we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | I don't know |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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 |



#15408



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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> | |



#15408



| | |
|---|--|
| 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15409



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

no

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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:



#15409



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
|---|----------------|



#15409



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#15409



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?



#15412



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:

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?



#15412



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#15412



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#15412



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Road increase investing in rapid transit network location.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15432



Protect waterways

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because all the idea above they are great

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Making the transport easier

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The regional fuel tax.

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:

Because the different location is better



#15432



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

About the project it is very important to the population

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:

Include the creation of some new public space

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:

Depending on the alternative of the site

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:



#15432



Use something can make the public happy

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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide | |



#15432



| | |
|---|---------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Other |
| 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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#15443



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

faster transport

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

card

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

reduce 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)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

need to be part



#15443



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:

fund to council services

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

no fund = more to spend

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:

benefit of public

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#15443



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

benefit of public

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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Other |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in | Support |



#15443



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?

none

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

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?



#15443



| | |
|--|------------------|
| 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. | increase in cost |

Tell us why

none

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

none



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

n/a

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

auckland venues, parks to pay less for hiring services.



#15463



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

to get better easier faster public transportation

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

no

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

\$33 million can be used for other services.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 auckland council shares



#15463



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

i dont have dear opinion about that

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

not sure

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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:



#15463



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#15463



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?

i support the board description of bus services.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |



#15463



| | |
|--|--|
| 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. | most of the priorities will cost large amounts of money which can be used in a different area. |

Tell us why

no

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

no thank you



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#15469



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

they sound good

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

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#15469



Tell us here:

continuing under council sounds best

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

council servies are so far really good

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

no

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#15469



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#15469



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local | |



#15469



| | |
|--|------------------------|
| 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. | looks good for future. |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15496



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

no

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:



#15496



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#15496



| | |
|--|---------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>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.</p> | Support |



#15496



6b. Do you have 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?

Henderson-Massey

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: Henderson-Massey

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 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?

Economic & Cultural development

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

City and local development



#15511



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support investment towards improvement of public transport. no much into investing for cycleway

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Making public transport faster, more reliable

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Reducing temporary traffic management requirements

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

When the stadium is developed it will serve more communities and generate funds

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

The council may loose the share but hopefully the investment will generate more funds



#15511



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 period of lease is too long : 35 years unless it is and reevaluate again

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

To Generate more needed money

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

no

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Hopefully more money can be generated

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#15511



Tell us why:

to avoid distribution with port authorities

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15511



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?

no

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water | |



#15511



| | |
|--|---|
| 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. | I support most priorities that aim at improving community cohesion and resilience |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

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: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#15547



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because some of the cycle ways can be annoying and if they have more bus lanes some drivers still go on it

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

Tell us why:

because it looks fine 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)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I don't know because i don't have enough information to make a proper decision



#15547



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

I believe that the port can improve their returns and profitability

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:

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:

Because i think things are fine the way they are

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#15547



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#15547



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

no

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |



#15547



| | |
|--|---|
| 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. | Because this helps our communities to better connectiveness and inclusion |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15549



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

NZders in control of NZ land and business we have a vested interest in ensuring outcomes benefit us directly

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



#15549



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#15549



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15549



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15570



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15570



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15570



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15574



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15574



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15574



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15582



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15582



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15582



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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 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?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15625



liaising more with the central government to get more funding for the city projects and reduce on getting money from locals by the increase of parking fines (pay and display parking spaces, offstreet parkings)

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

makes more sense to me

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

improving public transport throughout the city and extends it to intercity connection

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

spend less on speed bumps or humps - 200k per speed bump in some areas is just ridiculous

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Get an operational management which can come up with more initiative to better utilize this facility to be able to generate funds which can alleviate on the Council \$33m maintenance 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)?

Proceed with the proposal



#15625



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:

If the operation of the port has not been easy, then lease it and get rid of the operational costs/expenses of running the port and only get dividends from its lease to allocate to different projects.

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?

Other

Tell us why:

Auckland Council and Port of Auckland to work out mutual deal to create benefits for both parties.



#15625



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

Should the transfer option be adopted, then get captain cook and marsden wharves to be transferred to AC while Bledisloe Terminal to be remanded into Port of Auckland ownership. We don't want more trucks on the road to create more traffic then what we're suffering with

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15625



| | |
|---|---------|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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. | 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?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | 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?

less cycleways work



#15631



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because it is a much efficient way to use and spend the tax payer money

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

cycleways around shopping centres

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:

Because it is important for the council to keep some share in the AIAL as it is a secure income; and at the end of the day, the council will still be as an increase of rate

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#15631



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

no

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

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:



#15631



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#15631



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

no

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

not sure



#15637



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because all the proposals are good

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

reducing traffic

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

pay less on fuel tax

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

i don't know the problem of 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

All above sounds good proposal

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#15637



I don't know

Tell us here:

not sure about it

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

improvement of council services

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:

because they will provide public benefit

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:



#15637



because the council will use it to provide public benefit.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | I don't know |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | I don't know |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | I don't know |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | I don't know |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Other |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide | |



#15637



| | |
|---|--------------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |



#15637



| | |
|--|---|
| 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. | because most of the priorities will make change in our local board. |

Tell us why

no

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15639



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

I prefer for New Zealand to maintain control of its assets

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:



#15639



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15639



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15642



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

traffic are bad people need to take public transport

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

n/a

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

n/a

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:



#15642



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:

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:

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.

Other



#15642



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#15642



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#15645



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?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

no

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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:



#15645



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:

no i dont have any feedback.

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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
|---|-----------------------|



#15645



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Other</p> |



#15645



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?

no feedback.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15648



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15648



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15648



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15651



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15651



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15651



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15657



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)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Not enough information on both proposals to make an informed decision

4c. If the council 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:



#15657



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15657



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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): Te Pou Theatre

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15668



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:



#15668



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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |



#15668



| | |
|---|--|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?

See attachment



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15671



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Leasing creates revenue without ceding control

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#15671



The future fund should be funded centrally.

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#15671



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15671



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15677



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15677



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15677



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?

n/a

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce house rent and health care



#15678



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

n/a

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

n/a

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

n/a

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

n/a

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

No comment

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#15678



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 comment

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

n/a

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

n/a

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

No comment

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:



#15678



n/a

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p> | |



#15678



| | |
|---|-------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Other |
| 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. | 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?

n/a

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

n/a



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15695



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Don't sell the ground under your feet when things are tough. Pity about the outside of NZ attacks that destroyed 3 waters, but this is not the way to ride out the next decade. We need to husband our resources, make a cup of tea and tighten our belts as the pendulum finishes this swing and comes back again.

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



#15695



Tell us here:

Survive this crisis while doing our best to support each other

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |



#15695



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>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.</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?



#15695



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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15696



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15696



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15696



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15701



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15701



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15701



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15716



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15716



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15716



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#15726



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

no

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



#15726



Tell us 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 |
|---|---------|



#15726



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | Do not support |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Do not support |



#15726



| |
|--|
| 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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. | |
| 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. | |



#15726



| | |
|---|--|
| 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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15742



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Public transport - Faster

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Less traffic jam

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#15742



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#15742



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#15742



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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>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> | |



#15742



| | |
|---|--|
| 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

Not from the Franklin area

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15743



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15743



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15743



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15751



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#15751



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in | Do not support |



#15751



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | Support |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>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.</p> | Support |



#15751



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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>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> | |



#15751



| | |
|---|--|
| 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#15758



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 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:



#15758



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
|---|----------------|



#15758



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#15758



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. | |
| 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 | |



#15758



| | |
|---|--|
| naming) and Te Korowai Papatuuaanuku (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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | |
| 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?

The three options (central, more, & less) proposed in the consultation are not the only options, the same goes for the corresponding rates rises. For example, we could get much-needed investment in transport services and climate resilience, as stated under the ‘pay more get more’ option, with a rate rise of less than 14% in year one. There are



#15760



other areas where savings could be made which are not interdependent. The ‘overall direction’ oversimplifies very complex decisions.

We must prioritise looking after our people and planet by investing in the things that provide us with life’s essentials, such as fresh air, clean drinking water, hazard resilient landscapes and basic needs, like accessible transport and a sustainable waste network.

Where I’d like Auckland Council to do/spend more

- Public Transport - Ensure public transport is affordable, accessible, and reliable, prioritising investment in public transport infrastructure over road spending.
- Active Transport - Urgently transition towards low emissions communities by prioritising and increasing, not reducing, investment in walking and cycling infrastructure.
- Water Quality - Re-establish the full funding of the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.
- Environment and Regulation - Ensure appropriate funding is allocated to increase monitoring activity of current/active and future resource consents to enable better environmental outcomes.

As well as the options provided in the structured consultation, I would also like the Council to do more of the following:

- Protecting and working with communities by continuing to prioritise the funding and delivery of Making Space for Water in partnership with Central Government, including “blue-green corridors”. adding to our walking, cycling network while also creating a natural drainage area.
- Ensuring adequate support for community and social services, including contestable grants (such as the Climate Action Grant), the Live Lightly programme, the Communities in Need programme, and supporting work on Council land and marae. This can be achieved by re-establishing pre-2023/2024 budget funding for these areas.
- Supporting frontline, volunteer powered communities by ensuring local boards are adequately funded and grants are available. Grants and investment into community-led services provide great value to Aucklanders. For every dollar that Council invests we get back many more volunteer hours.



#15760



- Supporting moves to a circular economy and zero waste, ensuring waste materials are seen as resources to be reused, repaired, repurposed and recycled, and are diverted from landfill.
- Lowering emissions by becoming a leader in localised renewable energy generation by enabling local integrated energy solutions to support community owned energy groups.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Regarding the Mayoral proposal, I am encouraged to see initiatives to make public transport more accessible, such as the \$50 weekly cap and introduction of diverse payment options. Another positive is the work programmes which look to improve public transport services, such as network optimisation, expansion of the electric train fleet and completion of the City Rail Link. Unfortunately, alongside these positives, there are some concerns. A couple of examples are; the removal of 'low performing' bus services, and the several references to roading focused projects.

As well as continuing to invest and improve our public transport network, it is essential that the Council urgently supports the transition towards low emissions communities by prioritising and increasing, not reducing, investment in walking and cycling infrastructure.

Cutting "low-value initiatives, including raised pedestrian crossings and expensive gold-plated cycleways" is an ideological move that fails to align with the Council's own Transport Emissions Reduction Pathway. In monetary terms, this means cutting funding for cycleways by \$141.5 million. This makes no sense as we know increasing funding for active transport infrastructure is a smart investment that can benefit the economy, the environment, and public health.

I would like Auckland Council to aim for the UN recommendation of 20% budget allocation on walking and cycling, and to acknowledge the cost:benefit ratio of 10:1 to 25:1 for investing in cycling.

Cycling is a low-cost, low-carbon and low-impact mode of transport that can reduce congestion, pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions. Cycling also promotes daily,



#15760



incidental physical activity, mental wellbeing and social inclusion. By improving the safety, accessibility and attractiveness of walking and cycling, more people will be encouraged to choose it as a regular means of travel, creating a virtuous cycle of benefits. This approach also creates better use of existing roading assets by making space for those who cannot choose cycling, walking or public transport

I do not support investigating a bike ferry, but I do support advocating that Waka Kotahi opens a lane of the bridge for walking and cycling.

I support Lake road improvements, the Henderson Cycleway, Lincoln Road Corridor Upgrade, Great North Road Improvements, the Upper Symonds & New North Road Upgrade Project.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I want Auckland Council to spend more on safe, accessible, and attractive active transport infrastructure such as building and maintaining cycleways and raised crossings.

I want Auckland Council to spend more on investment in residential speed management and road safety programmes to reduce deaths and serious injuries

I want Auckland Council to spend more on ensuring public transport is affordable, accessible, and reliable.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

I want Auckland Council to spend less on new roading projects that prioritise private vehicles as the primary transport mode.

I want Auckland Council to spend less on road widening for projects, and instead reallocate road space for delivery of walking, cycling, and public transport networks, creating an overall more efficient, affordable, and climate conscious transport system.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:



#15760



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?



#15760



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#15760



| | |
|---|--|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?

Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)

Support

Re-establish the full funding of the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.

Revenue gained from NETR affects the delivery of essential projects to protect our biodiversity and taonga species. For example, the rate funds kauri dieback track upgrades, treatment support for landowners with kauri dieback, monitoring of the health of our forests and education for visitors to prevent further spread of the disease and predator control on our islands and the mainland. This work supports the health of our environment, which we need to be healthy to keep humans healthy, by filtering our water, catching and intercepting rainfall, holding our soils and slopes together and cleaning our air. Having spent years with large parts of the track network closed to protect kauri it is important to ensure this work continues as planned to enable safe access to our wild places, which are so important for our mental and physical health, and the health of our forests.

Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)

Other

Re-establish the full funding of the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.

Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate

Support



#15760



I would like to see the Council broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate action Transport Targeted Rate to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support the following local board priorities (other): |



#15760



| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding and support for community driven environmental work (e.g., habitat restoration, plant and animal pest control. • Funding and support for community groups that focus on climate action (e.g |
|--|--|

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15780



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Need to keep all operations and ownership in Nz

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:



#15780



Invest so Council spending is manageable without increasing burden on ratepayers

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#15780



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15780



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15790



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:



#15790



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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |



#15790



| | |
|---|--|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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 | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#15821



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because the proposal is good and much better for the people

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?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Because I don't know if this is a good idea or a bad idea

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#15821



Tell us here:

Because this will enable in council to have up front fund for council service

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:

But i thing it would be more beneficial for public

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#15821



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#15821



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15823



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15823



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15823



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Transport | |
| Water | |
| City and local development | |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15843



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Privatization might be worth entertaining in other areas, but for something as profitable as major ports in an island nation it's just a complete abdication of fiscal responsibility. The council would be selling off an income stream and will inevitably be forced to replace it with more taxes.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#15843



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Reinvesting profits into the future of Auckland would show a duty of care towards future ratepayers of this city. The future fund is not the problem, the problem is selling off known investments to fund it.

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | |



#15843



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>from what 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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>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.</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?



#15843



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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15844



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:



#15844



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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |



#15844



| | |
|---|--|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Affordable housing

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#15845



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Disagree with more cycle lane and increased pay for parking

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Reliable parking

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle lane

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Not a council issues for entertainment

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 idea

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#15845



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:

Future economic benefit in other ways

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:

Can generate more income as a different way



#15845



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#15845



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |
| 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?

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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15866



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15866



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15866



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15871



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15871



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15871



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15905



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15905



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15905



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15936



Tell us why:

I oppose the introduction of congestion charges

2a. Is there anything you 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)?

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?



#15936



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | |



#15936



| | |
|---|--|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?

Henderson-Massey



#15936



8. Do you have any other comments?

I support Auckland Council becoming an accredited Living wage 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15937



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

The people of Auckland need to retain control even if the port operations are leased out. A bunch of politicians do not have the right to just this thru. They did not contribute the money to build the operation. The people of Auckland did!

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



#15937



Tell us here:

This depends on what the Auckland future fund is designed for. If it's like the successful funds elsewhere in the world with politicians cut out from its operation it will work otherwise it will be another white elephant.

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |



#15937



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>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.</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?



#15937



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15960



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

POAL make money and has made improvement to ensure it can continue to do this. Any changes to who operates the port would make more money sure but all that profit will offshore. keep it local and keep it growing

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



#15960



Tell us here:

we need like the port to fund the council run correctly it will put\$ into the council which can help hold rates to a more affordable level.

4d. Do you have 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 **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.

Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.



#15960



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>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.</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?



#15960



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Manurewa

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

Keep existing services for rubbish and parks etc.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Council divest itself of social housing and support agencies. These are a central Government responsibility.



#15964



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

AT to become answerable to the Council. Not have the tail wagging the dog. Stop wasting money on unwanted projects eg MEOLA RD, New North Rd Mt Albert, K Rd etc.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#15964



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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |



#15964



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | |
| <p>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.</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?

Rates be paid on ALL LAND & BUILDINGS, including, but not limited to, Housing NZ, Government Agencies and buildings, religious institutions.



#15964



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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15972



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15972



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15972



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15979



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#15979



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#15979



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15984



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

concerned about the lack of control over fees

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:



#15984



the council should have access to the funds

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to</p> | |



#15984



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#15984



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#15989



Tell us why:

I oppose the introduction of congestion charges

2a. Is there anything you 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)?

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?



#15989



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | |



#15989



| | |
|---|--|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?

Henderson-Massey



#15989



8. Do you have any other comments?

I support Auckland Council becoming an accredited Living wage 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16013



Tell us why:

I oppose the introduction of congestion charges

2a. Is there anything you 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)?

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?



#16013



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | |



#16013



| | |
|---|--|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?

Henderson-Massey



#16013



8. Do you have any other comments?

I support Auckland Council becoming an accredited Living wage 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16035



Tell us why:

I oppose the introduction of congestion charges

2a. Is there anything you 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)?

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?



#16035



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | |



#16035



| | |
|---|--|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?

Henderson-Massey



#16035



8. Do you have any other comments?

I support Auckland Council becoming an accredited Living wage 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: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#16050



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

It is good for the citizen

2a. Is there anything you 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 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:



#16050



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#16050



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Other |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Other |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Other |
| <p>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.</p> | Support |



#16050



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#16060



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think the proposals are interesting

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

Tell us why:

keeping it sounds best option

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#16060



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

council operation would be most suitable

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:

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:

because the public can benefit

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#16060



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#16060



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local | |



#16060



| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| 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. | They all will be useful |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#16063



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

no

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Good 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)?

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



#16063



Tell us 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



#16063



| | |
|---|----------------|
| increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | I don't know |



#16063



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?

no

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16077



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:



#16077



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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | |



#16077



| | |
|---|--|
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16078



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Keep control of the port and its operation under the control of the people

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:



#16078



Keep rates down by using dividends from the port

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|--|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#16078



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#16078



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16083



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

POA should stay where and generally, as it is. The alternative of moving it would only work for the developers who want to make more money out of "upmarket accommodation". If the costs of operation are in question, then resolve that by way a public service should be. As it is, it's much cheaper to operate than to build a whole new infrastructure between Auckland and Whangarei. Potentially cheaper to re-introduce rail from POA to manukau for bulk products like coal, wheat ,silica sand etc. That would free up at least 60+ TnT units on the road to and from the ports on 'ship days' every hour. This would equate to about two trains, about 35,000 per shipment out of the ports. To privatise would put the ports into the hands of greedy financiers



#16083



and developers, further increasing already inflated transport costs. Just a few thoughts from me to the group.

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:

Upgrading future Auckland projects would be an obvious solution when managed correctly

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
|---|--|



#16083



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).

Discontinue the **Long Term Differential Strategy** which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.

Re-introduce **recycling charges for schools**.

Continue the planned roll out of **rates funded refuse collection** to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.

Introduce the **Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate** of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.

Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of



#16083



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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16090



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#16090



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16090



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16094



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#16094



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16094



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



#16097



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?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

no

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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:



#16097



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | I don't know |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | I don't know |



#16097



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#16097



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16127



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#16127



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16127



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | 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?

n/a

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

n/a



#16144



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?

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

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#16144



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#16144



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#16144



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?

n/a

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

n/a



#16147



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?

n/a

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

n/a

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:

n/a

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:



#16147



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:

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:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

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.

Other



#16147



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Other</p> |



#16147



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?

n/a

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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16162



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)?

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?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#16162



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16162



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16168



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Maintain current operation and avoid leasing out to other 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:



#16168



Help the people of Auckland businesses and port workers

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#16168



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#16168



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16176



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

The port has seen a massive turn around in performance. Its best to keep the profit coming directly to council

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



#16176



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#16176



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#16176



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16180



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

The ports of Auckland should always be in the control of New Zealand institutions (public ones) It is critical infrastructure (even if it moves geographically to another location with approval of the NZ public) To hand control of this sort of critical infrastructure to overseas/private interests is immoral and should be illegal without the blessing of the majority of New Zealand citizens

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#16180



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Councils are not properly funded. National government should share GST and while it doesn't this is my answer.

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p> | |



#16180



| | |
|---|--|
| residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#16180



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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16181



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#16181



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16181



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16182



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#16182



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16182



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16185



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#16185



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16185



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16207



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#16207



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16207



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16217



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

The ports of Auckland should stay in the ownership and control of the council for the benefit of port workers and the long term economic benefits of Auckland. I strongly oppose privatising the ports.

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



#16217



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#16217



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#16217



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16227



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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:



#16227



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16227



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16233



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

So that we have a say in where the funding will go from the lease and be able to stop the lease when needed in the future of our city

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



#16233



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#16233



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#16233



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16234



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#16234



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16234



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else 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



#16239



Tell us why:

I support improving public transport but dint agree with how much it costs

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

more on youth and Māori development

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Less on roads

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:



#16239



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16239



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16244



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#16244



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16244



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16249



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Too many New Zealand assets are controlled by offshore entities already. The port should belong 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



#16249



Tell us here:

There is no demonstrated advantage in the proposed 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?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|--|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to | |



#16249



| | |
|---|--|
| reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#16249



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16254



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Selling the ports off is a bad idea and the council knows it. They should not be able to sell the port for a one off short sighted cash injection

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



#16254



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to | |



#16254



| | |
|---|--|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#16254



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16299



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#16299



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16299



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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?

Assemble our Te Atatu Peninsula Marae quickly. Recognize our emergency traffic situation causing us stress and anxiety.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Needless roadworks of reconstruction during work hours cause terrible traffic to get to work.



#16308



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?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#16308



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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#16308



| | |
|---|----------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Do not Support



#16308



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do 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?

Auckland council events and programmes encouraged amongst local iwi Te Atatu marine progression to take place straight away filtering to the wider community.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#16333



Less advertising for promotion brochures catalogs and direct mail. Have direct one on one meetings in our community centers and libraries.

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?

Lift customer service, training for existing driver and lift the cop off their overtime availability..

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Training migrant bus drivers being employed by programmes.

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?



#16333



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?

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?



#16333



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |



#16333



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Do not Support

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |



#16333



| | |
|--|--|
| 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. | A time of rest ad recoperation needs to be implemented for Māori Te Tiri O Waitangi recognition to Tarugata Whenua needs addressing locally. |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Our Recovery Budget plan to be 2021 scrubbed. Recycling scheme to be compulsory initiated by manufacturers land retailers.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

Rubbish tin access returned to schools, bus stops and parks. Priority employment and training to tangata whenua encouraging local employment.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#16335



To pay less in rates with a cut back. Mentality can only mean more deprivation to Māori. Rates subsidy limitations to be lifted.

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?

Tell us here:



#16335



4c. If the council continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Council services are of value to all people in the whenua.

4d. Do you have 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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Do not support |



#16335



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#16335



6b. Do you have 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 Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Do not Support

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | Growth is the answer to prosperity for Tamaki. Growth in Te Ao Maori Kaupapa. |

Tell us why



#16335



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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?

Local meetings in the community. Te Atatu pensinusla marae build ASAP inorganic rubbish collection service more frequent. Community west Auckland services

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Movies in the park



#16344



Statues of (illegible) with no Maori history

Needless pavement upheaval on Compass place Te atatu

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?

Park and ride Pt Chev is not big enough

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?



#16344



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:

Council services has a lot of divisions to be accountable to. No corruption or international persuasion or influence

4d. Do you have 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?



#16344



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#16344



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?

It is a blessing that we have love

1) Have your say on feedback forms

2 Peoples panel

City colonisation has to be recognised



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?

Support most of the proposal



#16360



Tell us why:

I think cs they're changing the public transport for teens and removing the student discount.

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#16360



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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p> | |



#16360



| | |
|---|--|
| businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

NA

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

NA



#16388



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

NA

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

NA

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

NA

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

NA

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

NA



#16388



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

NA

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:

NA

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

NA

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

NA

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:



#16388



NA

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Other</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p> | |



#16388



| | |
|---|-------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Other |
| 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. | 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?

NA

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

NA



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?



#16398



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We still need cycleways and safe crossings for pedestrians, otherwise the city will still have issues with public transport being overwhelmed as it and cars will be the only method of traversing for short haul travel

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Rail integration. It is the best way to keep people off the roads, and the fastest form of public transport. Light rail/trams feeding into transport hubs could keep people out of intensified urban areas, and encourage economic growth for businesses by creating more accessible stores. Also reduced public transport costs. Public transport works best as a service rather than a for profit enterprise. By paying for public transport with a visible upfront cost, you are saving on many many more hidden costs, such as road maintenance, pollution controls, the cost of commuters time stuck in congestion, the price of logistics with freed up roads.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Changing road sizes. Trimming off parking or widening roads should not be necessary if public transport is working as intended.

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)?

Other



#16398



Tell us why:

Establish the fund, without risking a large share of Auckland Airport which is a vital piece of infrastructure that Aucklanders through council should have shares in.

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



#16398



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | I don't know |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide | |



#16398



| | |
|---|----------------|
| increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

Fairly Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | Very Important |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low | Very Important |



#16398



| | |
|--|------------------|
| 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. | Fairly Important |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | Fairly Important |
| 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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#16407



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:



#16407



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#16407



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



#16407



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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

Fairly Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | Fairly Important |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | Fairly Important |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | Fairly Important |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | Very Important |



#16407



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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#16408



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?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?



#16408



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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p> | |



#16408



| | |
|---|--|
| businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#16422



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:



#16422



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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p> | |



#16422



| | |
|---|--|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do 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?

To reduce council rates for the residential property

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

To reduce council rubbish bin cost and free rubbish collection



#16443



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We want more reliable transport in Auckland

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

public transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

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)?

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



#16443



Tell us 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?

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



#16443



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#16443



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?

Henderson-Massey

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#16475



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need to invest to create a sustainable future for Tamaki to address historic underinvestment and longstanding inequity issues across our communities, in the provision of infrastructure and community services that build resilience to the many changes we are face with and in particular climate change.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

The provision and upgrading of parks and recreational facilities and spaces in west and south Tamaki. When the pandemic hit it became clear that access to nature i.e. parks, water (lakes, sea and streams) and beaches were a key factor in individual and community health. The council needs to address the inequity issues of access by these and other communities.

Initiatives that support economic and employment opportunities for people and communities that have been subjected to historic inequity in investment and proper care. Using our procurement more deliberately and with proper commitment to not just setting targets but achieving them.

Invest more in Marae and associated papakainga development as community centers to support vibrant, connected and resilience communities.

Investing in mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga practices - as a bau aspect of council business through a partnership with mana whenua.

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



#16475



Tell us why:

I want to know that historic inequity issues of access, location and impact of these on the communities where current facilities are, have been properly considered before investing in a new facilities.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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:

Locking up the operations of the port for 35 years without a proper consideration the public access and use of the space is not good. Public access and use over time should be the goal.

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:



#16475



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#16475



| | |
|---|--------------|
| the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | I don't know |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?



#16475



8. Do you have any other comments?

Support the proposed increase to the Maori Outcomes Fund to maintaining an inflation adjusted commitment to an area of long-term underinvest to address significant inequity.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#16497



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:



#16497



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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p> | |



#16497



| | |
|---|--|
| We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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 less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I would pay more for the government to do the roads correctly at the start so that they last for 10+ instead of roads you need to redo every year and end up costing more and aren't good quality.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#16537



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

IDK

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:

IDK

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

I think that we are doing good using the bus lane but we don't need more.

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:

If they stay where they are we get no extra benefits but if we move them they do the same thing but it creates more benefits for the public while still doing its job.

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



#16537



Tell us why:

If they stay where they are we get no extra benefits but if we move them they do the same thing but it creates more benefits for the public while still doing its job.

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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing | Support |



#16537



| | |
|---|---------|
| the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I agree with the fact that we need to re-introduce recycling and go down hard on putting things in the right bin.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waitākere Ranges

Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitākere Ranges in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Initiatives to support community resilience and safety. | I support most priorities |
|---|---------------------------|



#16537



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Progress priority actions from the Waitākere Ranges Local Climate Plan (currently under development). | Very Important |
| Restoration and enhancement of significant ecological areas on local parks and in buffer zones around the regional park. | |
| Operating grants for arts and culture programmes delivered by our community arts partners, such as Te Uru. | I don't know |
| Continue to activate library spaces with programmes, services and events. | |
| Operating grants to support Glen Eden and Titirangi Community Houses. | |
| Invest in our relationship with mana whenua, Te Kawerau ā Maki. | |
| Initiatives to support youth/rangatahi. | |
| Progress an application for Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area to become a dark sky place. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waitākere Ranges 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: Henderson-Massey

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?



#16538



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

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:



#16538



4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | |



#16538



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?

Reduce the salary of councilors.



#16599



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?

Subsidize public buses.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The AT staff is too numerous.

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



#16599



Tell us 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



#16599



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Do not support |



#16599



| |
|--|
| 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of ‘fit for purpose’ local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |



#16599



Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.

I support most priorities

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

Enhance safety measures, increase surveillance points, strengthen youth education, and enforce strict discipline for delinquent juveniles.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#16622



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

This plan meets the current development needs

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage caused by empty buses.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Within 10 years, the existing sports facilities should meet the fitness needs.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

The shares are fundamental



#16622



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:

We can coordinate the allocation of these funds to ensure they are utilized to their maximum potential.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

This can create more public benefits.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#16622



Tell us why:

Maintain the current profitability of port operations.

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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |



#16622



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low | |



#16622



| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 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. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?

Reduce the salary of councilors.



#16907



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?

Subsidize public buses.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The AT staff is too numerous.

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



#16907



Tell us 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 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</p> | <p>Support</p> |
|--|----------------|



#16907



| | |
|---|----------------|
| around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Do not support |



#16907



| |
|--|
| 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of ‘fit for purpose’ local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |



#16907



Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.

I support most priorities

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

Enhance safety measures, increase surveillance points, strengthen youth education, and enforce strict discipline for delinquent juveniles.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#16925



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

This plan meets the current development needs

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage caused by empty buses.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Within 10 years, the existing sports facilities should meet the fitness needs.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs



#16925



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:

We can coordinate the allocation of these funds to ensure they are utilized to their maximum potential.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

This can create more public benefits.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#16925



Tell us why:

Maintain the current profitability of port operations.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#16925



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low | |



#16925



| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 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. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services. Crack down harshly on juvenile crime, such as daytime robberies.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#16946



I hope the government can consider the interests of the people and minimize unnecessary expenses as much as possible.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

This plan meets the current development needs

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I haven't been there myself, but I've heard about North Harbor Stadium. I hope it can better serve the public.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#16946



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

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:

Professional company management can yield double results with half the effort.

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:

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum effectiveness.

4d. Do you have 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:

Expanding benefits through mode conversion.



#16946



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

This operational area brings employment and facilitates unloading for Auckland.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#16946



| | |
|---|---------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#16946



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>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.</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | |
| <p>Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.</p> | <p>I have not seen the proposed priorities of the local council for 224/225.</p> |

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: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services. Crack down harshly on juvenile crime, such as daytime robberies.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#16959



I hope the government can consider the interests of the people and minimize unnecessary expenses as much as possible.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

This plan meets the current development needs

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I haven't been there myself, but I've heard about North Harbor Stadium. I hope it can better serve the public.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#16959



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

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:

Professional company management can yield double results with half the effort.

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:

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum effectiveness.

4d. Do you have 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:

Expanding benefits through mode conversion.



#16959



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

This operational area brings employment and facilitates unloading for Auckland.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#16959



| | |
|---|---------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#16959



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>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.</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | |
| <p>Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.</p> | <p>I have not seen the proposed priorities of the local council for 224/225.</p> |

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: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#16969



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

This plan meets the current development needs

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs



#16969



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:

Professional company management can yield double results with half the effort.

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:

These funds can be strategically utilized in municipal operations to generate significant returns and benefits with minimal investment.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

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:

Expanding benefits through mode conversion.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#16969



Tell us why:

This operational area brings employment and facilitates unloading for Auckland.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#16969



| | |
|--|---------|
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>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.</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?

Upper Harbour

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do 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?

Safety measures need to be upgraded, and more surveillance cameras should be installed on neighborhood roads

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#17308



Road renovation should be prioritized and focused

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?

Increase the number of road surveillance cameras.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Elevate pedestrian crossings and bike lanes.

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:

Change the current operating mode of the Auckland Port, and promote the Auckland Future Fund to better serve the citizens and communities.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#17308



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:

Addressing the initial funding for some of Auckland's future funds.

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:



#17308



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#17308



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local | |



#17308



| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 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. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17310



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:



#17310



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17310



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>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.</p> | Support |



#17310



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17310



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17311



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)?

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?



#17311



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17311



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>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.</p> | Support |



#17311



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17311



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do 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?

Safety measures need to be upgraded, and more surveillance cameras should be installed on neighborhood roads

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#17312



Road renovation should be prioritized and focused

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?

Increase the number of road surveillance cameras.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Elevate pedestrian crossings and bike lanes.

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:

Change the current operating mode of the Auckland Port, and promote the Auckland Future Fund to better serve the citizens and communities.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#17312



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:

Addressing the initial funding for some of Auckland's future funds.

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:



#17312



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | <p></p> |



#17312



| | |
|---|---------|
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17313



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?

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:



#17313



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#17313



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Support |
| <p>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.</p> | Support |



#17313



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17313



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17315



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:



#17315



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17315



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17315



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17315



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17316



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:



#17316



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#17316



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17316



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17316



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17317



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:



#17317



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17317



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17317



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I do not support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17317



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17318



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:



#17318



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17318



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17318



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17318



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17320



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:



#17320



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17320



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17320



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I do not support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17320



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17321



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)?

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?



#17321



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17321



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17321



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17321



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17322



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?

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



#17322



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17322



| | |
|---|----------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17322



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17323



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?

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?

I don't know



#17323



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17323



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17323



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17323



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17324



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:



#17324



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#17324

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17324



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I don't know |

Tell us why



#17324



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17325



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?

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



#17325



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount | Support |



#17325



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17325



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17325



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17326



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:



#17326



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17326



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17326



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17326



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17327



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:



#17327



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17327



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17327



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17327



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17329



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:



#17329



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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17329

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17329



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17329



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17330



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:



#17330



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17330



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17330



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17330



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17331



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)?

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?



#17331



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17331



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17331



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17331



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17332



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:



#17332



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17332



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17332



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17332



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17333



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:



#17333



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| 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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17333



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17333



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17333



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17334



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:



#17334



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| 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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17334



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17334



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17334



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17335



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:



#17335



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17335



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17335



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17335



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17337



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:



#17337



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17337



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17337



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17337



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17338



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:



#17338



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



#17338



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>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</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17338



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?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |



#17338



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17339



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:



#17339



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17339



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17339



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17339



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17340



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:



#17340



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17340



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17340



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17340



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17341



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)?

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?



#17341



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17341



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17341



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17341



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17342



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:



#17342



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Do not support |



#17342



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17342



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17342



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17343



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)?

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?



#17343



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in | Support |



#17343



| | |
|---|----------------|
| harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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 |



#17343



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17343



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17344



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:



#17344



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17344



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17344



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17344



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17346



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:



#17346



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17346



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17346



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17346



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17347



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:



#17347



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17347



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17347



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17347



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17348



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:



#17348



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Do not support |



#17348



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17348



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17348



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17349



I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

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:



#17349



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Do not support |



#17349



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17349



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17349



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#17350



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:



#17350



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#17350



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17350



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17350



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17351



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)?

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?



#17351



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17351



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17351



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17351



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17352



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:



#17352



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17352



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17352



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17352



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17353



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:



#17353



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17353



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17353



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17353



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17354



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)?

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?



#17354



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount | Support |



#17354



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17354



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I do not support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17354



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17356



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:



#17356



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17356



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17356



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17356



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17357



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?

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?



#17357



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17357



| | |
|---|----------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Support |
| 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?



#17357



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17358



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?

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:



#17358



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#17358



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17358



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I do not support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17358



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17359



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)?

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?



#17359



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17359



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17359



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17359



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17361



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:



#17361



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#17361



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17361



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17361



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17363



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)?

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



#17363



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17363



| | |
|---|----------------|
| residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17363



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17364



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)?

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?



#17364



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <p>Resume the 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17364



| | |
|---|----------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17364



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I do not support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17365



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:



#17365



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17365



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17365



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17365



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17367



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?

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



#17367



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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?

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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value | Support |



#17367



| | |
|---|----------------|
| residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17367



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17368



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:



#17368



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17368



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17368



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17368



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#17370



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:



#17370



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?

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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that | Support |



#17370



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17370



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17370



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17372



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#17372



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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17372



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17372



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17372



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17373



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)?

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?



#17373



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17373



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17373



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17373



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17374



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)?

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:



#17374



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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17374



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17374



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17374



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17375



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:



#17375



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17375



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17375



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17375



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17376



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:



#17376



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17376



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17376



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I do not support any priorities |

Tell us why



#17376



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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 | 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?



#17377



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)?

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?



#17377



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17377



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17377



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17377



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17378



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)?

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?



#17378



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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17378



| | |
|---|----------------|
| from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17378



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17379



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)?

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?



#17379



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17379



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17379



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17379



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17380



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)?

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?



#17380



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17380



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17380



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17380



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#17381



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:



#17381



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Do not support |



#17381



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17381



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17381



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17382



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:



#17382



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| 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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Do not support |



#17382



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17382



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17382



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#17383



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:



#17383



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Do not support |



#17383



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#17383



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support all priorities |

Tell us why



#17383



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17385



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)?

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?



#17385



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 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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17385



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17385



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17385



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17390



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:



#17390



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17390



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17390



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17390



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17391



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:



#17391



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17391



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17391



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17391



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17392



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)?

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?



#17392



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 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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#17392



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property. | |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation). | Do not support |
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools . | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change. | Do not support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area. | |
| Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries. | Do not support |
| 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?



#17392



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#17392



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Henderson-Massey

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?



#17394



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:



#17394



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#17394



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p> | |
| <p>Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p> | Do not support |
| <p>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.</p> | Do not support |



#17394



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community. | |
| Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | I support most priorities |

Tell us why



#17394



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?