



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

Written Feedback

Hibiscus and Bays Volume #1

April 2024



| Sub # | Organisation Name | Page Number |
|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 46 | Debras skincare centre | 13 |
| 319 | Ahutoetoe School | 141 |



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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 less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| 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?

Community events, graffiti removal.

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



Any social service provision.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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



Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

As a park or council facility, no housing, retail or hotels.

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Do not support



#2



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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). | 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.

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

No

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



Eliminate unnecessary planning when there are already plans in place. Stop dreaming up ways to spend money.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Optomise transport based on economic analysis.

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

No

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

Unnecessary use of traffic management.

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

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

Tell us why:

We have already made a substantial and it's a management problem. Stop spending money on new stadium proposals. We are sick to death of hearing about a waterfront stadium.

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

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



Tell us why:

Continue to use dividends to reduce rates. They are obviously a good investment. That's why everyone wants to buy them.

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

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

Tell us here:

We don't want to lose control of the waterfront.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Port investment can be funded through debt like any other business.

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:

Don't spend anymore money on the waterfront.



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Keep as is to minimize costs.

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>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> |



#19



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have 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?

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?

I do not support any priorities



#19



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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Reduce costs to a minimum.

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

Couldn't find this document



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): Debras skincare centre

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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?

Fix the beaches

Happy to pay more for water

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



No

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Need it

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

Buses

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

Raised crossings

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Never used - poor management

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

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

Tell us why:

Don't sell assets



Government need to fund

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

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

Tell us here:

Needs to change

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Need 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?

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

Tell us why:

Waste of space

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:

Waste of space

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. | Do not support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in | Support |



#46



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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. | 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. | |

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

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?

I support all priorities

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



#46



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Vaughan's Road Okura to Long Bay needs to open.

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

Don't do events.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

More money on roads, none on Cycle Ways and no more raised pedestrian crossings.

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

Fixing roads

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

Raised pedestrian crossings

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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?

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:

Build a stadium

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



#50



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> | <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>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> | |



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

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

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?

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |



#50



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

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

Open Vaughan's road to Long Bay

8. Do you have any other comments?

Open Vaughan's road to Long Bay



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

Auckland council has become massively overloaded in social, cultural, and environmental concerns that to be honest are far from their core job. They have focused on these to the detriment of core services and completely lost focus on their



actual job, of providing and maintaining basic city operation. Their internal management does not service the needs of ratepayers, instead working to 'effect change'. This has to stop.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because this plan is based on a want to effect change in transport, not provide service. People just want roads without holes in them, and traffic flows to be enhanced, not 'calmed' after years of active work to make driving worse on Auckland we have seen the outcome of worse traffic - congratulations. Get rid of T3 lanes. Stop tabletops designed to make people slow to 15 in a 50 zone. Put light phasing back to maximise throughput. None of this costs. Stop building hugely overpriced ', solutions' for tiny minority of fashionable users, le: cyclists, which never actually delivers.

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

Council transport designers redundancy payments

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

Cycleways, traffic calming, busways, monitoring cameras, exceeding crossings and lights.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Chance will inevitably have high cost blowouts as the council have proven incompetent at such management. This will simply result in a firesale to developers benefit, as we have seen so often lately.



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

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

Tell us why:

We need less spending on a massive scale. This is just think big politics at work, and will be a disaster.

Just stop spending on what internal policy activists wishlists to effect change contain!

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

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

Tell us here:

Yet another fire sale of assets so it can be splurged on Wasteful spending. Prove you can be economically responsible first!

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

Other

Tell us here:

Reduce your out of control debt.

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

Tell us here:



The council have been, and continue to, act like a 21 year old with their first credit card and rich doting parents.. Splurging on lifestyle and fashionable causes. There are no rich parents, and debt becomes crippling.

Get responsible. Stop eating other people's money. The people who's money and future you are spending now are hurting!

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

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

Tell us why:

Council have proved incompetent in such processes. Do not burn bridges until you can prove you are functional.

The downtown carpark being a perfect example.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Same as above. Stop trying to 'think big'. Get back to your 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. | 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 |



#61



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | Other |
| <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 |



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

Local board priorities

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

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Not Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Not Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Not Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Not Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Not Important |



| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Not Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Not Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Because you have out of control spending. Take for example the post to nowhere asking the road by dairy flat school... Incredible. Incompetent.

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

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

Dairy Flat

8. Do you have any other comments?

Get back to core council operations and new Zealand values. Stop acting like a teenager on a mall spending spree!

You are harming your residents. You are severely harming the low and working classes. You are out of touch with your residents. You have become controlled by pressure groups of upper middle class activists. This has to stop.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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



I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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> |



#91



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | 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?

Waiheke

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

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

Other

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

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | I don't know |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | I don't know |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | I don't know |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | Not Important |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | I don't know |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | I don't know |



Tell us why

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

Public safety wardens.

More camera surveillance of public spaces.

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



Remove Eke Panuku and start investments that support the community rather than acquire public property.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Keeps the status quo at least.

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

Gulf harbour ferry services and bus connections.

Anything else that reduces peak hour road use.

Fixed and mobile Speed cameras.

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

Road speed bumps.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Need unbiased information to determine social and business benefits of stadium to local community and greater Auckland.

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

Proceed with the proposal



Tell us why:

It's a non strategic asset and diverts council efforts away from council business.

It's also looks like a very political issue for council internally. So divisory.

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

Other

Tell us here:

Remove port and develop land into stadium., etc.

Further develop Whangarei and Tauranga and train links to take over PoA capacity.

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Not core council business any more.

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

Return valued property to public use.



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

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

Tell us why:

Return for Public purse and enjoyment.

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> |



#99



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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 |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support most priorities



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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Focused on quality of living experience in neighbourhood.

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

Reasonably well balanced.



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

Put the rubbish bins back at the parks

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



Cut the movie nights in the park. As a rate payer I don't care or want a movie in the park especially when the rubbish bins have been removed. Keep the bins ditch the movie nights. And instead of wasting money putting unnecessary speed hump pedestrian crossings everywhere just fix the roads that have damage. Prioritize the roads not the speed bump pedestrian crossing.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Under investment for too long. No trains where I live . I hate the bus will never catch it rather have cheaper fuel

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

More lanes on the northern motorway heading towards town always jammed. Goes from 3 lanes to 2 and then back again. Always jammed no matter what time of day (late night exception) weekend is worse.

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

Bus lanes . AT as a whole waste money
the stupidity of that organization never ceases to amaze the public

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Under utilized facility



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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

If the council has more money that's less burden on the rate payers. Rate payers need a rate freeze for once. Auckland council is always the 1st to raise prices in the form of rates.

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:



Just want to pay less rates

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

More imports exports to generate revenue

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>Other</p> |



#123



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Support |

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

Too many increases. Cost of living crisis you mfs

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

More public transport but not more roads. Aucklanders need to grow up (like Sydney siders) and accept that driving a car to work is a privilege (for those who move around during the day) and not a right.

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



Costs are spiraling out of control at the moment. Everyone is managing their costs, so should the Ak Council.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Need a boutique sized sport stadium

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

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

Tell us why:

Ride out the downturn. Make informed decisions in better times

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



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

No

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

Get rid of ak cars not used now, mow regional lawns less and get rid of bureaucracy



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Public transport should be available to everyone and roads should be good

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

Trains to Silverdale, improve the motorway to 3 lanes to Silverdale make e scooters and those using roads e g e scooters to pay a percentage of road user charges

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

No

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It is the only stadium on the North Shore and by doing this keeps traffic from going over the bridge to other stadiums

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Good ideas



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

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

Tell us here:

The council should not be involved leave it to other businesses

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 idea

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:

It will improve this area for tourists and locals

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 for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what 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>Do not support</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</p> | <p>Support</p> |



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#137



| | |
|---|------------------|
| community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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 lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <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> |



#164



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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 |



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

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?

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



#164



| | |
|---|----------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Investment in public transport on the North Shore to the city eg light rail, support residential home take up of solar and provide more dog friendly areas.

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



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

Light rail connection from North Shore to the city

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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.

I don't know



#211



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |
| <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> |



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

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

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?

I don't know

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | I don't know |



#211



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

No mention of storm water or climate actions

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | As proposed |
| 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?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Raised crossings and cycle lanes.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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 |



#251



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



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

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?

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



| | |
|---|----------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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?

Surf Life Saving Auckland requires funding to repair buildings damaged by weather events and all clubs need guaranteed support for the future.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

The public security problem needs to be solved urgently, and more activities to boost the economy should be organized

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



Don't invest too much in building bicycle paths and renovating prisons. Let prisoners' labor reform generate economic value.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Private cars are still the mainstream mode of transportation, and there is no need to invest too much in public transportation. I support stopping the renovation of bicycle lanes and sidewalks.

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

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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



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

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#260



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



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Concentrate on Infrastructure only

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

Leave environmental and social issues to central government



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Can't be trusted to invest our money. Significant waste of money on undeliverable outcomes ie raised pedestrian crossings and cycle lanes

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

Public Transport

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

Crossing and cycle lanes

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Stadium needs meet the needs of the local community. Engage local business, schools and clubs to find a solution.

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

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

Tell us why:



Council needs to govern and control costs.

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

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

Tell us here:

Council needs to govern and control costs.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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:

Port of Auckland needs to run more effeciently and nationally make better use of other ports ie Whangarei

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:

Port of Auckland management cannot be trusted to operate whilst they have so much land.

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. | 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. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |



#265



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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. | Support |

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

Developers are not investing enough into infrastuture

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?

I do not support most priorities



#265

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

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Environmental and social issues should not be part of the councils mandate

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

Roading, wastewater and sewerage



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

Alternative harbour crossing, more bike path infrastructure, greater safety and security.

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



I want to see the council ensure our dollars work harder and hold people to account when they do not deliver/build/complete critical projects on time.

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?

Bike and walking infrastructure so people have an alternative to driving and can explore the city safely

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:

Redevelop the area and put it to greater 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)?

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

Tell us why:

The airport needs to be a part of the overall city consideration particularly from a tourism and transport point of view. Retaining this is critical to ensuring the city has a say



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

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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:



We need to make better use of our prime land area to create engaging , safe paces for people bin the city

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> |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Not Important |
|--|---------------|



#274



| | |
|---|----------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

We need to ensure that the area is developed in a sustainable way. Currently the priority should be schools and infrastructure not on cultural or wellbeing initiatives.

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?

Stop the over development of Hibiscus Coast and Rodney areas, support our schools, improve safety in the inner city and STOP allowing Kainga Ora to build monstrous housing developments that destroy our communities



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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 |



#287

| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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 |



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

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?

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



#287



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.

Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Very Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#300



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |
| <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> |



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

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

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?

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#300



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

I don’t know

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

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

I want more and better infrastructure for cycling and walking. Full stop.

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



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I want more and better infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists. Please don't stop raised pedestrian crossings. Instead, put one in at the crossings near Mairangi Bay school and Murrays Bay school asap!

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

Pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.

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

Car infrastructure.

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

I have no idea about 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:

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



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

Tell us here:

Seems the most sensible thing to do.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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:

It's prime waterfront land which could be enjoyed and used by many people rather than used to offload used Japanese cars.



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>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>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> |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

Other

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#303



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



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:

This is a North Shore facility that should not be taken away. If managed properly it could attract more events and concerts and run at a profit. Transport options for Eden park for the people of North Shore is basically rubbish. Having attended several conferences at the stadium over the years there is an obvious opportunity for further expansion.

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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



Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Do not support



#304



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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). | 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. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



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

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

Local board priorities

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

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?

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped | Not Important |



#304



| | |
|---|------------------|
| reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

To be able to cycle over the harbour bridge.

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

No public rubbish bins



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Only focuses on vehicles, no focus on cycling

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

To be able to cycle over the harbour bridge.

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

Roading for vehicles

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

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

Tell us why:

Current management cannot attract any sports team or public events. Now there is an NX route there there should be no reason it couldn't host almost anything.

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

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

Tell us why:

Rates are unsustainable



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

Other

Tell us here:

Sell it, drop the rates right down. Get us a cycle path over the harbour bridge.

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:

Get rid of ports of Auckland. It's a commerce zone. Move the ports to somewhere with less dense population,

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

Tell us here:

To be able to cycle over the harbour bridge.

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

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

Tell us why:

Get rid of ports of auckland

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

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



Tell us why:

Get rid of ports of 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>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>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>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. | |
| 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?

To be able to cycle over the harbour bridge.

Local board priorities

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

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support any priorities

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

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



#305

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

Tell us why

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

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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



#305



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

Please get a better deal from the mowing/parks maintenance contractors.

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



Bring AT into line - they are out of control, not answerable, waste so much money.

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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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 we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in | Do not support |



#314



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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> | 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 |



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

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?

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | I don't know |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | I don't know |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Not Important |



#314



| | |
|---|------------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Just clean up the existing reserves and walkways please. Back to the standard we had several years ago.

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Other

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

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

COUNCIL AND ITS umbrella organisations should focus on core responsibilities and less big ticket items such as pulling down stadiums and building others. Focus on using what we have . Auckland Central is not the only area in this city.

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



Less big ideas , especially pet projects that council want to be remembered by. More local input and implemetation responsibilities given to our local boards. They do a better job than Auckland Council central

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

make it all user pays, we dont have ferries in the northern part of the city nor rail. Our only option is a disjointed bus service that does not meet up with feeder buses and there alone you can loose 40 minutes a day . Lets face it this city has been stuffed up transport wise by big ideas and lack of forward planning over the years.

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

better bus service on the shore

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

less on speed humps, less on Auckland transport full of broken promises. Less on work contracted out with no council check and quality controls

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

the council has already bailed out the north shore stadium . We have enough stadiums around under utilised as it is without one been built on reclaimed land in Auckland central. there is nothing wrong with the stadium in Albany been there used as part of the Albany complex,probably biggest problem is the public transport options to events at it



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

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

Tell us why:

Just sell the shares and be done with it , not a lot of voting power holding 11% and all other silver ware in the kitchen

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

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

Tell us here:

its a stand alone business and just more silver in the kitchen that council want to get rid off to push their big ideologies. It provides an income as it is and supports many families in Auckland as it is. Proposals to move it elsewhere is ludicrous who has ever heard of a city in the world with a harbour that does not have a port

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

council income should be used for here and now for the benefit of those here now, shortfall made by council cutbacks and rates and charges

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

Tell us here:



Future Fund- if council cannot currently balance books without loans etc how do we know a future fund will not be just gobbled up and not used for what its supposed to be. Future funding is something to have when the council is on top of its current obligations instead of chopping back on core responsibilities

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

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

Tell us why:

council wants to take this away from POAL simply as the area to build a new stadium that will be another white elephant. Why would you spend 410 million dollars to take land away from POAL therefore reducing your income from POAL

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

council has enough other areas besides auckland central it needs to be dealing with. Auckland central is not an area i like to visit at best of times as nothing there that would entice me there besides cold windswept streets

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>Do not support</p> |



#318

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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> |



6b. Do you have 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 refunded refuse collection- people should pay for their bins to go out we have here on the northern shore for some years .It works if people see when they buy their sticker how much it costs and whether they can cut their waste back

all these things should be user pay,

i never knew schools were not charged for recycling , i presume that this is covered in my rates and it is not in there. User pays. we should also have to buy a tag to put out recycling and that component removed from our rates

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?

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

very keen to have community and iwi led initiatives. I would like to see more resources put into this as well as pressure put on likes of Auckland Transport watercare Auckland city council to remove pest plants from their land.. this may mean some of the

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

well i just discovered the PDF page number does not equal the documents page numbers

Split Auckland city back up into the 5 cities it use to be

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Ahutoetoe School

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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?

Economic development. Make it easier for the businesses and groups to organise events but don't use AC resources to create or distribute this.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Promote cycle ways and pedestrian options.

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

Cycle ways and pedestrians options.

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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



Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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



#319



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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 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, | Support |



#319



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

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

Re-introducing recycling charges for school is not acceptable.

Schools educate the next generation on how to and why to recycle. Without this service provided, schools won't commit to recycling and learners will not be involved in this process. This loss of connection to the understanding and responsibility to recycle will be seen in the next 10 years as learners leave school and have less of a proactive and educated understanding of recycling. Paying for it now is a much lower cost than paying for poor recycling habits and understanding in the future.

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?

I support most priorities

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

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.

Fairly Important



#319



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Building more roads

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

Fewer cycleways, fewer events and other waste



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Don't support capped public transport passes.

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

Need more roads built and widened

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

raised pedestrian crossings should be cancelled

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

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

Tell us why:

The cost of demolition is likely to be high. Needs to be managed better to get more events and put the seats back the way that it was before the council ruined it and removed half the stands.

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



Are we should sell the shareholding and not sell the portable can operations. We don't need a fund like this because the return suggested 7.5% is unlikely to happen.

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

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

Tell us here:

Because then we have complete control. I think the porch should be moved over time and it's going to be impossible to move it if we give a lease away.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Because it provides an income to the city.

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

Tell us here:

I think that the suggestion that you get 7 1/2% is extremely unlikely. We've had a a long period of growth, won't always continue that way.

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 may be possible in the future but we haven't sorted out the tank farm and other wharves yet. Let's do this first. We need a beautiful green space with something like the opera house on our harbour, but there seems to be no proposal for that.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Are as above we haven't sorted out the other wharves yet, we missed out on sale GP because we can't get ourselves organised

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>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.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#326

| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have 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's a totally absurd idea to have rubbish anything other than pay-as-you-go, we want to discourage rubbish usage. The rest we need to stop spending so much money.

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays, Upper Harbour



Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why



Most of the things involve no actual actions, except for the Greenway network. The rest is just wishy-washy.

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

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | Very Important |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | Very Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | Not Important |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | Not Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | Not Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | Very Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | Not Important |



Tell us why

Some of this is just unnecessary like an Ethnic People's plan. Nor is it the council's job to do anything around climate change. A better, larger library with MUCH more parking would be useful.

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

seems ok.

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

None of the above

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

Feels like we don't get nearly enough investment on the shore so more needs to come out of the council to pay for these things.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?



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?



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>Support</p> |



#347



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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. | 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |
|---|------------------|

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:



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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#396



| | |
|---|--|
| 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Keep up regular maintenance/improvements of key infrastructure so we are not hit with huge expenses when it's found to be not fit for purpose or in disrepair!

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



Keep up regular maintenance/improvements of key infrastructure so we are not hit with huge expenses when it's found to be not fit for purpose or in disrepair!

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?

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:

Sell land, just have fields, demolish the stadium, and save 33 million

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

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

Tell us why:

Get out of port business, it seems a millstone around our necks!



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

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

Tell us here:

I don't think running the port is a business the council should be in!

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:

Keep ownership of the port land

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

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

Tell us why:

If we make changes then people will get these ideas about what to do with the area and then those ideas will cost money that money is better spent on infrastructure

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



Tell us why:

As above, if there is no change, then no grand ideas for new use, save money for infrastructure

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> |



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

Identify key city infrastructure, learn of its condition and what money is required to maintain/improve it as necessary, and sort out funding sources (like user pays) so this infrastructure is maintained properly. No flashy things like new stadiums, cycleways on the bridge, shiny new road signs, raised concrete pedestrian crossings, funding parades and feel good events, do the basics right and first!!

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?

I do not support most priorities

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



#408



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

What use is a festival, park activities, special events, feel-good things, etc. when my beach is too polluted to swim in?

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

Yes I think that you REALLY need to look at AT

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



AT spending. Speed bumps wasted money on traffic lights every few hundred metres.
Outrageous spending

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

You have empty buses at present why should we be spending more money on empty buses. Look at timetables. It isn't hard.

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

No just budget

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

Less buses running so frequently

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Why would consider redevelopment??

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



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

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

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#412



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

Hibiscus and Bays, Waitematā

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#412



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

No

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

No



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

There is nothing for the north shore

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

Light rail for the north shore

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

Auckland council office buildings

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

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

Tell us why:

Update the stadium and get more control over it going be it back to the trust who ran it better then the council are 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:

Once you sold the shares you can't get them back



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

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:

Then the money can be used at a later date and out would be ongoing

4d. Do you have 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?



#413



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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 no

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?

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
|---|------------------|



#413



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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?

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As 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 that I am aware of



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Too broad. Unknown details

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

Ferry services from Whangaparaoa - for tourism and choices to work IF people want to.

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

Central city services. More people work from home now more often

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

No interest

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

No interest



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

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#417



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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> | |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Not Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response | Not Important |



#417



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Fairly Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Very Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Not Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Not Important |

Tell us why

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

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

Rodney

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Agree with no more raised pedestrian crossings but don't agree with stopping cycle ways

2a. Is there anything you 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:

I always wanted the airport shares sold

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

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

Tell us here:



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#430



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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</p> | <p>Support</p> |



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

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

Local board priorities

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

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?

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Very Important |



#430



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do 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 regular garden waste collection better proper recycling, better street surface maintenance, lighting and signage that makes sense

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



no

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

like all of them and especially the last one

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

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

getting cyclists , pedestrians and motorised transport separated

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Its a dog

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 brainer if you are short of cash

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



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

Tell us here:

much better business model for the City. Port needs relocation to North Port will make that easier

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

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

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

Tell us why:

much better use of the area for the city's benefit and tourism generator

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:

see above

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>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> |



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

no

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?

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our | I don't know |
|--|--------------|



#433



| | |
|---|------------------|
| community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

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

pretty general descriptions that could apply anywhere -could have been written by AI.
Lacks specifics

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

Recycling bins and water drinking fountains at parks, beaches, playgrounds

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



less bike lanes, less expensive pedestrian crossings, less over the top traffic management for road works

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?

bike lanes, cones, traffic management,, raised crossings as stated

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Current management are useless, get proactive management that remove barriers to events and then host events. north shore is growing, plan for future

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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



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

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#434



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#434



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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 smart rubbish collection,seperate metals into seperate bin,seperate glass,paper from plastic,make recycling easier and more cost effective.

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



No more speed bumps, what was wrong with painted zebra crossings.

No more cycle lanes on roads too dangerous for cyclists.

No more badly designed town centres with no parking, I like my bike but I love my car in the rain.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I hate raised pedestrian crossings, they are annoying, if you have to put something like red light cameras instead, only a few idiots drive through a zebra crossing, fine them.

The trouble with cycleways is the lack of understanding by Auckland Transport on how and where to build them.

Public transport in Auckland is a bad joke, not enough big buses during rush hours and no smaller mini buses during the day, when have you seen a full bus at midday, one size fits all does not work.

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

Drains, waterways, power and supply.

Dangerous roads.

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

Town centres, plants, cycleways, judder bars.

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

Other

Tell us why:



Invest more money,make it bigger better,otherwise sell the land,sell the stadium,theres no middle ground.

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

The needs to hold on to every funding option at the moment.

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

Tell us here:

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



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

Tell us why:

The council is losing tax income, maybe in the future the council can take the wharves but not now.

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 for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what 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> |



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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. | Support |

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

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?

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

Try to control operating expenses more effectively.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Not necessary to have raised pedestrian crossings!

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

No

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

No

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

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

Tell us why:

Its an important asset for the Shore, but needs to be used more often!

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Seems sensible, long term.

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



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

Tell us here:

Looks financially, the better choice.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Return on ownership like that needs to be used to ensure such assets continue to operate in good condition.

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

Tell us here:

Self insurance does not sound like a good concept. Retaining ownership of council land is important.

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:

Reducing current council assets gradually places it at greater risk of exploitation by those who buy those assets.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



Tell us why:

It is a matter of predicting if shipping will increase or diminish over long term.

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. | 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 | Support |



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

Nil

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?

I support all priorities

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



#450



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Keeping things simple and as they mostly are already, is adequate. Going down paths to create more ideas always costs money, and yet does not always work as not enough is known of the ideas.

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

Broadly speaking, I support.



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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

I don’t know

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Too much TTM at the moment. Do not need raised pedestrian crossings.

Agree to make public transport better.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Current operational management is not managing stadium adequately.

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

4d. Do you have 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:

Don't quite understand. Need more information.

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



#456



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



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

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

Local board priorities

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

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?

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Not Important |



#456



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 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?

I like the idea of redeveloping North Harbour Stadium into something that will actually be used.

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



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

More buses more often

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

Dynamic lanes. I live in Whangaparaoa and they're only in use for a small amount of time and the congestion is still quite high around those times.

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

I like the idea of redeveloping North Harbour Stadium into something that will actually be used. I'd love to see what options are proposed for the 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)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know



Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

As long as cruise ships and container/cargo ships have a location to dock, I like the idea of using more of the waterfront for some else. ie waterfront stadium

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?



#457



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



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#457



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Would like to see how someone could better utalise the assett

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Support



#462



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura 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>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> |



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipātiki, Upper Harbour

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

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



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

Tell us why

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

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on | Not Important |



#462

| | |
|---|------------------|
| the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

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

Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community | Fairly Important |
| Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control. | Fairly Important |
| Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation. | Very Important |
| Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture. | Not Important |

Tell us why

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

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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



#462

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | Not Important |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | Not Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | Not Important |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | Fairly Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | Fairly Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | Not Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | Not Important |

Tell us why

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

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).



Which of the following options do you support?

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

No - Stop wasting money

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

Yes - Have a large restructure of council - Could cut staff levels by at least 30%.



Compared to councils in other countries Akl council is way overstaffed

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Definetly stop spending money on cycleways and raised crossings

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

No -

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

Dont spend anything on raised crossings / cycleways

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

REdeveloping it ? Seriously ? Costs will blow out - just keep as is

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:

Transferring to the council will mean council will spend more money on redevelopment of areas - meaning more rates increases . When wiull the council learn - Dont spend money you dont have. Stay within your means

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 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>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>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> |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

When you apply targeted rates, this is trying to hide the true increase in Rates.

I don't agree with it. And forcing ratepayers to pay Rubbish collection as part of rates rather than allowing people to pay as you throw with rubbish is appalling - Some of us don't put much rubbish out, but are expected to pay a set fee. I DON'T want that - like the food scraps was forced on us. It's totally absurd and another underhand way for council to take more money by stealth

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?

I do not support most priorities

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



#464



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

For a start consulting with Mana Whenua is just an expense that is not needed - they should have no more say than others.

Continue the paths network ? Save the money - you are in debt !!

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?

AT needs to be abolished



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

Rapid rail

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

I enjoy sport and Auckland has a paucity of stadia. Could it be redeveloped for international cricket. The current proposal for Colin Maiden park is silly.

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

Other

Tell us here:



Sell the land and move the port

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | I don't know |



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

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

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?

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped | Fairly Important |



#484



| | |
|---|------------------|
| reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1 - The bus and rail public transport system is in desperate need of drastic improvement, and fast, I feel. We are so far behind other developed cities around the world in this regard, and its been an issue that's been kicked down the road for far too many years now. Better public transport networks which can also reach further out of



#520



the central area will also enable people to have more choice in where they live, being able to live further out in more affordable areas while still being able to reliably commute. This would of course dramatically ease congestion on our roads as well. I'm sure you guys have already crunched those numbers and know better than the rest of us that we urgently need this.

2 - We were recently informed that tetra packs aren't going to be recycled anymore, and nor are smaller plastic items like bottle caps.

Those items are recyclable in other countries, were recyclable here, and if anything we should be doing much, much more to recycle and minimise waste. This reduction in recycling effort feels like the exact wrong direction we should be heading in, at a time when the world is facing a waste crisis. I hope our council reconsiders and prioritises our responsibility to the local and global environment. We were once called "Clean Green New Zealand". Please help us Kiwis reclaim and keep that title.

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

Anything that takes the pressure off working Kiwis and gets the ultra wealthy ones to pick up more of the slack. The growth of inequality is getting out of hand here. I've got mates who are highly skilled and experienced in their fields and are still having to work two jobs just to support their families. This should not be happening anywhere in the world and definitely not in NZ. Meanwhile the wealthy here aren't sure which Ferarri to buy next with all the money they have which should've been paid in taxes to help support Auckland, NZ and all our fellow Kiwis.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

More bus lanes and rail lines

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



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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

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:

Those wharves which are used for cruise ships disrupt public transport (ferries). I hope the Council can turn those areas that better serve the people who live here rather than those temporarily visiting, who could land somewhere else. People who commute

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>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</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#520



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | I don't know |
| 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. | 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. | 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?



8. Do you have any other comments?

I can't emphasise how much so many Kiwis are suffering because of our failure of a public transport system. We need more buses and trains. More bus lanes and railway lines. The ability to commute to more places and further from the center, and to do so quickly and reliably. This would be a win for everyone, including car-drivers who will spend less time stuck in jammed up roads. Less cars and less idling in traffic also means less emissions. Less people spending time doing nothing while stuck in traffic or waiting for buses that don't arrive means more time spent being productive (better for economy) and more time for selves (eg time that could be spent on fitness, time with family, etc), and better overall quality of life for Aucklanders (also better for economy). We've fallen so far behind the rest of the developed world on this and this issue's been kicked down the road for far too long. I really, really hope the council will prioritise this.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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?

Sure cut the Mayor and Deputy Mayors salaries and increase the days that they need to work. No tennis breaks.

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



Nope

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cyclways don't need to be on motorways.

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

Roads and Road Saety

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

Cycleways

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Greater use by the community and also leave green space.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 assets are necessary for the long term.



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

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

Tell us here:

To agree to lease it out is incorrect. We do. To know if the council could lease it to the Chinese or any foreign entity and that too for 35 years is ridiculous.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

The AFF seems a wishy washy entity maybe proposed by our current leadership, who seems to change their mind on subjects everyday.

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:

And than spend 110million to move operations, that's comical.



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The roads cannot support the traffic now, so in 15 years things being to be transported by heavy vehicles would be a disaster.

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. | 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 |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support all priorities

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



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

To live and leave in a better community now and for the future.

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

Fewer stadiums



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?

Cycleways, raised crossings, speed bumps

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Other

Tell us why:

Get rid of it. It has always been a white elephant

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

Other

Tell us why:

Privatise AIAL and Auckland Port

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

Other

Tell us here:



Privatise

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#532



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura 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> |



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

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

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?

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Not Important |



#532



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Other

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

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



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Bureaucracy, without efficiency improvement, will lead to nothing. If we want to increase spending, we need to bid for projects globally, rather than letting local monopolies waste taxpayers' money. Capital spending can only be supported if the efficiency of using funds can be improved.

2a. Is there anything you 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?

Other

Tell us here:

Port of Oakland needs to relocate



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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 | Do not support |



#544



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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> |



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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Reduce number of wasteful middle managing clueless council staff members and the salary’s of the rest.

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



Focus less of our budget on the city centre and allocate spending to areas in relation to the amounts of rates received from.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I like the idea of getting pedestrians off of the roads in the city as that massively slows traffic flow.

But in reality Auckland needs to invest in trains, trains and more trunks like any other large city that has great public transport, get out of the past of just throwing money at roads and road works and actually get people out of their cars.

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

Trains.

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

Woke pandering.

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

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

Tell us why:

North Harbour stadium was always well managed and looked after but the original trust until the super city council got their hands on it and quite frankly completely ruined it.

So many good events both sporting and entertainment were held there and regularly and since council got involved it has been embarrassingly handled.

Restore it back to its glory and invest in a openable roof and just watch what happens.



Most importantly tho remove council control as unfortunately they haven't got a clue on how to run it.

Selling any part of it off or downsizing etc is criminal.

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

Auckland future fund seems common sense however selling interest in our only international airport is not smart. This has been shown time and time again that selling integral infrastructure is bad in the long run and is very selfish short term thinking by those elected to make decisions for all on our behalf.

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

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

Tell us here:

1 year of lower rates.. come on.

If you can't think outside the box to create revenue from such a large entity as Auckland council without just selling stuff then honestly you need to retire.

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:

Some money to the future fund and the rest just as usual



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

Tell us here:

In reality of the ports of Auckland doesn't 100% need to actually be here in Auckland city then perhaps the option to move it elsewhere where it might have better more efficient access etc is the right move.

Then all that land can be used for all manner of other options. While still retaining overall ownership of course.

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

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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 | Support |



#556



| | |
|--|---------|
| <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 |



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

Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays,Rodney,Upper Harbour

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



| | |
|---|----------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

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

Rodney Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Fairly Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Fairly Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Very Important |



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Very Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Very Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Fairly Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

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

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

Silverdale (Rodney End)

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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



#556



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | Fairly Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | Not Important |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | Fairly Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | Fairly Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | Very Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

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

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).



Which of the following options do you support?

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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> |
| <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>Support</p> |



#561



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | I don't know |
| 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. | 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. | 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?

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?

I support most priorities

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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>Very Important</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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Sort out the CCOs - they seem to be hindering rather than helping the councils work!!!

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



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

An integrated transport system is important. It must include both better roading AND public transportation

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

Parking!!! Our public transport system falls over because there is insufficient parking to support users of the public transportation system.

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The North Harbour Stadium used to be a good facility that seemed to be well used. Under current management it has gone backwards. We need to review management of the stadium and do a feasibility as to what the best option is moving forward.

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

My concern is that is that Auckland airport must serve the needs of the city, both to support domestic and international travel and also freight services. The interests of



Auckland - and the country - are key. If AIAL can do this, then that is great - but we don't need another ineffective CCO

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

Other

Tell us here:

I don't see how having a large port in the centre of Auckland city is a good use of valuable resources - surely there are better locations for a port that can serve the city - and the country - that don't create the problems that the port does

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:

I find it disappointing that the status quo long term plan is as expensive as it is. Proposed rates increase are above projected CPI. Why are ratepayers expected to fund these increases. It appears to be poor planning and lack of accountability.

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

Other

Tell us why:

As above - I think we need to be look at alternative locations for our major port.



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

Other

Tell us why:

As above - I think we need to be look at alternative locations for our major port.

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>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> |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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. | 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

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



#573



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

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

Roading and transport are the key issues on the Hibiscus Coast

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Public transport even if we do not use it.

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

less new roads just maintenance



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Get of the roads and on to rail

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

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

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

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

Tell us why:

We need a sports facility north of the bridge.

No silly ideas about a waterfront stadium or other mega nice to haves.

Make the best use of existing facilities.

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

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

Tell us why:

Just a clever device by the mayor to privatise and sell off public assets after the sale of all the AKL airport shares fell through.

Selling the family silver is not a sustainable solution.



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

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 old neo-liberal myth that public is bad and private is good. There is absolutely no reason why a private operator would necessary be better. What is however certain is the fact that a private operator would be creaming it filling their own coffers with no benefit to the public owner of the land.

Just get proper high quality management into the port operation.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

The future fund is just the Trojan horse for privatisation. Why on earth have another layer between any council asset and the council/public ?

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

Tell us here:

Move the port eventually north to Whangarei with a first class rail connection to the inland port in Auckland.

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

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



Tell us why:

Eventually the port should move north anyway.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

In the meantime keep the port fully functional.

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. | Support |



#596



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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 . | 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. | |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

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?

I support most priorities



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

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

To many wasteful grants to business associations like Silverdale.

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 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?

environmental projects

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

urbanization



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

we need raised walkways - wildlife crossings too so i don't really support as these seem not to be the concern

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

wildlife crossings

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:

its all about protecting investments, ie \$ and mitigating risks, ie \$ and not necessarily about what is right so idk

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



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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

for both - remember the environment and the wildlife



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>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></p> |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

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

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#610



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

the natural spaces are most important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#612



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | |
| <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 |



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

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays,Rodney

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Very Important |



#612



| | |
|---|----------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do 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 transports networks by adding rail to north shore. Add cycleways.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

traffic is a friction on life in Auckland, improving it will be a multiplier for everything I do. I am curious as to what 'time-of-use' practically means, I do support demand based pricing for access to roads.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

rail infrastructure, cycleways.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

We have a well placed facility that is underused. Rather than writing off the investment we should at least attempt to get a reasonable return. When I tried renting part of the facilities last year I got no response from the team...

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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 shouldn't be in the business of running airports or ports, it should support services and growth. Having the fund lets us divest in these non-core assets and focus



on what we need. I do question the rate of return asserted in the consultation doc, it seems high.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:

If we keep it as an active income stream it should be used to provide the services we actively need, not try and build a war chest.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Self insurance given the size of the council is a good idea, with the backing of 3rd party for worst-case. Having the port eventually move out of the downtown area would be nice.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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 harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Our area lacks safe cycleways and even the walking paths can be hit and miss. This increases congestion and removes the health benefits from these active travel modes.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The priorities are just advocating, not doing. What are you going to do?



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Generally agree, specifically in favour of reduced spending on raised pedestrian crossings.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Make the stadium more suitable as a concert venue, as an alternative to Mt Smart and Spark arena.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Best financial idea yet. Free up capital for more profitable investment.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



Tell us here:

This maximises the Auckland Future Fund which will maximise returns.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

As above, maximises the Auckland Future Fund which will maximise returns.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

This would maximise public use of waterfront assets for entertainment and display.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

It would depend on the need for a public benefit or port operation, and I'm not an expert.



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>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> |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#615



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

I support enhancement of all outdoor facilities and activities for all ages

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I support the budget.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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 more |
| 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?

Don't continue to expand the greater Auckland area with new suburban developments, especially north.



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?

Continue to maintain and expand on rail network resilience with a long-term goal of reducing outages and maintenance by building it right, now.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

CBD bus access and intra-CBD bus projects

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I do not have enough information on actual plans of what this could look like to provide certain feedback.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

I think Option 3 provides the best balance

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

The benefits are not worth the cost of moving with respect to other financial implications of the LTP

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Efficient operations of POAL should be prioritised and maintain the status quo.



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>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>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>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> | |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

WQTR: Option 3

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | I don't know |
|---|--------------|



#630



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

There should be additional capital investment into environmental services

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Increase capital investment and maintenance budgets for parks

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Do less of activities that should be funded by central Government. (ie Transport, Housing, Flooding, Roothing, Cycleways etc).

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Should be funded by central Government

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Parks and Beaches

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycleways, Road Humps and Judder Bars.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Long term population growth requires facilities such as this stadium.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:



AIAL should produce a better dividend than some vague investment fund of dubious management and cost potential.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Improving profitability should be a council priority, while retaining control over Port Development to enhance ratepayer use.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Do not dilute the returns by directing them through some fund of dubious quality.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Self insurance is a good idea.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Using Port assets for public benefit is a no brainer.



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 for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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. | Support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Do not support |



#647



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#647



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Our greatest asset is our environment

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stopping raised pedestrian crossings



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Waste of my money.

I don't use public transport much

I am retired.

You don't seem to think what increases in rates mean to retirees

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Salaries

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Why not

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



Makes great deal of sense

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Sensible

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:

Don't know

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

No feedback

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Don't know



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:

Don't know

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. | 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. | 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?

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?

I support all priorities



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Don't know

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Don't know



8. Do you have any other comments?

No comment



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Transport | |
| Water | |
| City and local development | |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Spend less on events. Instead get businesses or groups to fund these.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Agree with stopping plans for raised pedestrian crossings - such a waste of money. Disagree with buying of electric buses when other buses quite new. Need to spend more on roads - many in poor state. No new rapid transport other than city rail network. Let's get what we have working well.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Repairing roads

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cone management, no more new electric buses

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:

To have a fund manager would cost more than you save



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Private ownership will manage the ports better than the council ever could and you'd have continued income

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:



#677



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>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>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> |



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#677



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Many events target minority groups. At a time when funds are short businesses and local groups that have an affinity with the event should be approached to sponsor

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Good

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

In the transport section you've grouped roads along with public and active transport. I believe you should separate these for clarity. Too often public and active transports are the poor cousin to roads. Often their budgets seem massive but when split out without stormwater or services upgrades the true budget becomes much clearer.



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less roads please. Wildly expensive, and don't do a thing to deal with congestion. Unless it's space reallocation (eg liberate the lane)

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Removing the cheapest and best value for safety proposals (ie raised tables and protected cycleways) while leaving in the expensive parts is crazy.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Protected cycleways, using reallocated road space.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roads.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

There might be some community or club level uses for this stadium area but there isn't as far as an actual stadium. Frankly we have too many stadia in Auckland without a good plan for utilizing 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:

Short term gain doesn't seem that smart to me

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

That area is prime for redevelopment. Don't lock in 35 years of private ownership where you won't be able to do any of that

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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:



We don't need a working dock in the best part of a modern city.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

My first reaction is to gain this for aucklands use without it being a port, but I don't know enough about the financial arrangements.

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> |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | 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?

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?

I support most priorities



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Mostly fine. Nothing about Browns Bay town centre which is disappointing.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

We don't have a dedicated Cricket Stadium - lets get something fit for purpose for that. The rugby, well, we're not just a rugby nation, and they can go to other stadiums around the city.

NHR doesn't exactly get much of a following and Eden Park can be multi-rugby Union orientated, if that's where we're keeping Rugby (although something more central would be beneficial for all - Eden Park is a pain to get to, even with the rail improvements, especially from the north).

NH stadium needs redevelopment for cricket, and perhaps other minor sports, but don't get rid of it and redevelop it for housing or just local grass roots community sports - what a waste of an area, and transport links. Why are we a city that doesn't have a dedicated cricket facility - Wellington, Hamilton, Queenstown, Christchurch, the Mount - all have purpose stadiums and yet the largest city in NZ - Nah, terrible drop in pitch with small boundaries and terrible spectator interaction; no wonder no-one turns up to watch.....

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



Tell us why:

The airport will improve, and with it dividends.

The airport will go fully private, and probable fare increase will come.....

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Get rid of the port and sell off the land, it's a terrible place for a port to be, with terrible transport links.

Could be some limited redevelopment, perhaps a proper waterfront stadium, but also good opportunities for public facilities and interaction with the water.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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:



Public open space, may be some more eateries, but don't let this get sold over to private developers who'll do nothing more than build high-rise apartment blocks

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:

Waterfront stadium - don't let this get sold over to private developers who'll do nothing more than build high-rise apartment blocks

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. | Other |



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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. | 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?

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?

I support all priorities



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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?



#736

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support 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:



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>Do not support</p> |
|---|-----------------------|



#736



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>Do not support</p> |



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#736



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Two things we must all pay more for;

Resilience for management of storm water, waste water and potable water.

Improvement for all forms of public transport at the deliberate expense of pressurising those who continue to insist on using private transport.



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Councils around the country have allowed themselves to become overblown behemoths that try to be all things to all people. Much more focus on basic infrastructure to facilitate living in and moving around the city. Much less focus on the nice to haves which were never conceived in the early days of Council service as a public service duty.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Dynamic lanes have come of age with the sophistication of AI technology.

Forcing cycle lanes into city streets barely wide enough for two passing cars never made any sense.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Join the rail network to the airport. Are we third world? Create toll road options. Why the NW motorway tunnel was never tolled is beyond me.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It is under-utilised. It's like building a school and having it open only for eight hours per day and not weekends. How us that good use of public money?



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Diversification

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Generate investment capital. In its existing format PoAL will never generate a level of profit to rival that possibility, Good and bad management comes and goes, most of the port's value is tied up in the underlying land reclamation. Let an international port manager make an attempt to do better but rest assured such an organisation will be ruthless about divesting those bits which do not contribute sufficiently for their purpose.

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 force decision making which has a robust financially astute reason and meaning.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



Every individual that decides not to purchase insurance is accepting de-facto self insurance. We've seen where that leads for some people, twelve months ago. The proposed Future Fund must be viewed in part as that self-insurance facility for Council.

Waterfront land supporting a commercial port makes import resources cheaper in NZ's biggest city. Conversely, port land would make more income for Council if it was covered in commercial buildings and apartments. There may be room for both. There will never be a reason to sell the landholding.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

Marsden wharf has lain partially deconstructed for several years. Complete the demolition. Develop an extended deep water berth on the west side of Bledisloe. Return Captain Cook to Council.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

With the removal of Marsden wharf, which has not been commercially viable for a number of years, the inner end of Bledisloe west could be deepened (yes I know, it's papa rock) to add enormously to the commercial viability of that wharf.

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



#745



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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></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> |



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

My perception about targeted rates is that businesses have more capability to pay than individual residents. Also they generally make more significant use of the resources which we all pay for.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

It is apparent that some CCO activity, particularly that of AT does not always appear to support the direction of the Council. That needs to change.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Concentrate on core services and ensuring tenders for contracted services are competitive. Maintaining essential municipal infrastructure only.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

No further bus or bike lane development at council level. Concentrate on the basics. There needs to be a government plan on public transport, including a funding model based around road user charging to help facilitate public transport development.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I would look at optimizing traffic flow around our city. Less traffic light phasing, by more one-way systems where possible, Examine local intersection design, simply wherever possible, including limiting turning where viable.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Yes - council should NOT be involved in cultural, arts, festivals, and events, apart from assisting with providing spaces where suitable infrastructure already exists.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

The North Shore has ***** such facilities already. The Hibiscus Coast is expanding - we need more not less.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

POAL need to be considering inland port operations, and development of ports away from the city, whatever solution it may require. The CBD should be limited only to cruise terminal and public transport operations for the most part.

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> |



| | |
|---|---------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#756



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Flood prevention

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



I would prefer to see three years of regular but moderate increases than high, low, high (7.5, 3.5, 8)

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Would like to see Penlink protected in this plan.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Penlink happening faster.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#772



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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> | |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#772



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do 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?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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> |
|---|----------------|



#790



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <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>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> |



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Not Important |



#790



| | |
|---|----------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Reduce the number of back office staff to get back to levels before the Goff era. Why do we need all the flashy multi-coloured reports? It is symptomatic of wasting money unnecessarily. Our income will reduce as the OCR is reduced and I think that council also should tighten its belt.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 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 |
|---|---------|



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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, | Do not support |



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped | Not Important |



#797



| | |
|---|------------------|
| reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Traffic enforcement



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Not interested in cycle lanes, raised pedestrian crossings consider them a waste of 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?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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



#842



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> |
| <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> |



#842



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays,Rodney

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Not Important |



#842



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Not interested in mana whenua, why don't you stop engaging in stupid legal battles with resource consents etc and just renew the rock wall at Orewa beach and just rebuild the stone wall and stop wasting money on sandmoving machines.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Its all flowery prose lacing in precise outcomes.

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Fairly Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response | Not Important |



#842



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Very Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Not Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Fairly Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Fairly Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Not from the Rodney area

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?

Investing in renewable energy, environmental conservation, and sustainable infrastructure (for example recycling facilities for diapers and soft plastics). Improving access to healthcare services, including mental and dental health resources. Investing in technology infrastructure and innovation hubs to attract talent, foster innovation, and



drive economic development. Ferry & train infrastructure is very important to remove cars from the roads. There is not enough of it, especially in places like Whangaparoa and late at night or over the weekend.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

(1) be cautious about approving excessive development projects that could strain infrastructure, exacerbate traffic congestion, or lead to environmental degradation. For example, in Gulf Harbour we have over 6k in population we have only one road access to it, we don't have a supermarket (not a 4 square), a doctor, the closest urgent care is in Red Beach and the hospital is in Takapuna. (2) Streamlining bureaucratic processes and reducing administrative overhead to improve efficiency and responsiveness in delivering public services. For example, the process of Building and resource consent can be done more efficiently with fewer employees from the council being involved.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We can not stop any infrastructure work, it is essential to build better transport in Auckland. The average Aucklander spends 154 hours per year on rush hour traffic. If I don't have the ferry, it takes me 2 hours and two buses each way to get to work every day. In contrast with the ferry, it takes me 50 mins each way. This does not take into account the fact that I might have to wait for the second bus for 30 minutes.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

- Accelerated programme for electric ferries (decarbonise ferries)
- Adding more electric trains which will reduce transport emissions
- Removing rail crossings that hold up traffic therefore reducing the level of congestion
- Increasing levels of public transport services that support greater access to public transport
- More investment in residential speed management and road safety programmes to reduce deaths and serious injuries



- Developing urban cycleways and walking connections to support greater mode shift and reduce reliance on cars

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Streamlining bureaucratic processes and reducing administrative overhead (from AT) to improve efficiency and responsiveness.

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:

Ultimately, the decision to keep or sell shares in the airport should be based on a thorough analysis of the council's financial objectives, risk tolerance, and market conditions. It may also involve consulting with financial advisors or experts to make an informed decision that aligns with the council's long-term interests. However, currently, my view is a no. Keeping the shares provides the potential for Dividends, providing a steady income stream and the council maintains some level of control and influence over the airport's operations and strategic decisions.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:

A catastrophe bond (cat bond) could be considered as a tool in Auckland's toolkit for managing the financial risks associated with climate change.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

We should reconsider our focus on developing the central city and acknowledge that many people are reluctant to commute there for work due to inadequate transportation and infrastructure. Continuing to invest in central city development under these circu

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

We should reconsider our focus on developing the central city and acknowledge that many people are reluctant to commute there for work due to inadequate transportation and infrastructure. Continuing to invest in central city development under these



circumstances is not a wise use of resources. Instead, we should prioritize retaining the revenue generated by 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>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>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> |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

Hibiscus and Bays,Rodney

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#845



| | |
|---|------------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

AT plans to extend the popular NX2 Northern Express rapid bus service along O Mahurangi-Penlink to Whangaparāoa when it opens in 2026.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

You need to focus on Public transport- invest in the Ferry and extend the popular NX2 Northern Express rapid bus service along O Mahurangi-Penlink to Whangaparāoa when it opens in 2026. You also need to focus more on bringing other infrastructure to the areas, hospitals, doctors and supermarkets at the end of the peninsula.



Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Very Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Very Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Very Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Very Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Very Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Very Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | I don't know |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | I don't know |



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Ensure that Venetia and other contractors for Council do their roles to a good standard. Not haphazardly like mobile street weed sprayers

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Nothing specific

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Stop the nonsense re raised pedestrian crossings, over the top speed limit reductions.
(eg inner Murrays Bay streets @ 30kph

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

See the Tell us why

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Has become a white elephant as is

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Support on basis that astute professional Managers will be in place to ensure good returns for the Future Fund



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

My caveat would be that we don't want a Darwin NT situation with the lease being granted to a Foreign Country. Rather it should be a NZ entity like the Superannuation Fund to take up the lease.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Stated before

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Nothing

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

In time would like to see further areas of the Port have Public access similar to what Wellington has



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>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>I don't know</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <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. | 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. | 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#846



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Obvious priorities

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?

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 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?

Less waste of money on unnecessary road works (raised crossings, speed tables, road realignments, etc.) and a demand for accountability from the roading contractors



of the money being spent reasonably and prudently (too many road cones, too many people, too much time and not enough progress).

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?

Speed humps, pedestrian crossings, raised crossings.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

To get better use out of it.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other



Tell us here:

Move the container port to somewhere else and allow the area to be used in a better way.

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 | |
|---|--|



#866

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>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> | |
| <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,</p> | |



#866



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna. | I don't know |
| Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces. | Fairly Important |
| Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan. | Not Important |
| Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu. | Not Important |



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park. | Fairly Important |
| Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Kind of racist aims there.

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

You need to sort the roading out as a priority. Lake Road is absolutely abominable, has been for more than 20 years, and nothing has been done to date with little hope for the future - where is your plan?

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
|---|------------------|



#866



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

You have little money to spend. Use it wisely, not frivolously. Cut the dross and focus on the things of actual importance.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Public transport between the Coast and Auckland is poor. Don't let it get any worse.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Public transport needs to be improved drastically.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

A new crossing between Auckland city and north shore.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Traffic management and inferior quality roads.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

So the stadium can host more and larger events.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Insurance costs are too high.

Climate change?

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Council services have deteriorated. We do t even have rubbish bins anymore.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#871



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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). | 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. | 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 |



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> |
|--|----------------|

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>Very Important</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>Very Important</p> |



#871



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Reduce traffic

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Very good

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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 less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Just spend wisely..cut the waste

Prioritize

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Cut the fat

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?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It needs to be multi use..for all

Concerts, markets..

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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 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>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> | |



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#877



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Spend wisely

We don't have a second chance

8. Do you have any other comments?

I've been personally affected by the carnage that is the current council, especially those at the very top

Budget cuts should equal to transparent spending

We need to look beyond ourselves, but for the next 50 years..

Election year can't come fast enough...

I totally respect our local board members..they are brilliant..the man at the top..

Got no words..



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | 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?

Keep AND USE North Harbour Stadium

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

This is an awesome stadium but hasn't been used/managed properly for years. We need this stadium in the North AND it needs to be managed properly.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 | Support |



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | I don't know |
| <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> | 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 |



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Very Important |



#880



| | |
|---|----------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

subsidize bus fares

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

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 |



#889



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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 around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p> | <p>I don't know</p> |



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Can't afford more. Don't want less.

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:

I live on the north shore, but tend to go to central Auckland 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:

More benefit having a fund with readily available cash. Can only use the investment in AIAL if it's sold anyway.



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Lease POA don't sell.

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:

Whichever option don't want to pay more. But equally don't want to pay less and go backwards.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Lease only. Don't sell.

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:

In this 10 year plan, leave it to make money for us. We have the viaduct and Wynyard for entertainment. Hopefully Queen street will look better soon too.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

We have other areas of Auckland to play in.

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. | 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 | Support |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

No

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#891



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Stop cheap nasty houses being built in our suburbs

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Good



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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Sounds like an excellent plan

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Turn into GREAT alternative

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Seriously! Aren;t we trying to be an international city?

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



Tell us here:

Let COUNCIL get on with COUNCIL - get investment to get the port happening. Images are stunning and will then enable Council to do so many more things

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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 |



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



#896



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

These are all connected and because the hub is OREWA, this requires significant priority. The growth with population is significant

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | 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 |



#901



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Not Important |



#901



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.

Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Fairly Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

more public transport and infrastructure investment in areas that are not CBD. e.g. Stanmore Bay is the only public pool in all of Whagaparaoa, Silverdale, Orewa, Millwater region

1d. Is there anything else 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:

Cycleways and pedestrian safety is well worth investing in

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Contractors & materials. Find a way to get the cost down.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Don't sell any more land. We need any public land for future recreation

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Why sell shares that generate income. It does not make sense.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:

It is not council business to make the country future proof. Central government needs to come to the party by properly taxing high income earners and using those additional revenues to future proof the whole country.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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 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>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> |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#926



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Fix the roads

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Spend less on everything else and reduce staff



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Focus on cars

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Roads

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Everything else

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Waste of money

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Reduce rates everyway

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:



#929



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>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></p> |



#929

| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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?

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?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Not Important |



#929



| | |
|---|---------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Stop wasting money

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Too much cost to ratepayers

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Trains. Helping more houes get built. Better management of waterways so we don't keep filling our harbour with microplastics.

1d. Is there anything else 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:

Why on earth would we cancel cycleways? It is clearly healthier for people & planet...

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Rail, cycleways.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roads.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

I've never used it for community/personal reasons, would be great if it served the wider community better.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Do we need to lose one to create another? Is there a way to build new fund without selling another asset? From what I remember reading those airport shares have performed incredibly over their lifetime?



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Keep the productive asset and increase rates too.

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:

Make Auckland City cooler. We've got a lot of catching up to do if we want a city that offers as much as Wellington. Gives so much more value to tourists and residents if this space is repurposed to serve them.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

THIS LAND LOCATION IS SO MUCH BETTER USED TO CONNECT OUR CITY AND ITS PEOPLE. A port can operate at places other than the centre of the CBD. But you can't use other places out of the CBD to be a space that would connect and bring value to the CBD like this land.

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>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>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> | |



#931



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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. | 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 don't understand the WQTR proposal? It talks about resuming a targeted rate but says the effect of which will reduce the rates paid? I'm never in favour of tax cuts/rate cuts if the result of which is reducing spending on infrastructure.

Please continue to invest more in our water management, the Waitemata Harbour needs all the help it can get. Very concerning data on microplastics in our harbour.

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

We need to act now re: climate change.



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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No. There just isn't the money.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Think about your home...when times are hard and money isn't there, you don't go on holiday, you don't go to events, you don't travel...the same should be the same for council...only important things that effect safety need to be done, but events, gardens etc, they can wait.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Millions will be wasted in stop/start schemes...make a plan, stick to it and deliver.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

a bus lane from Albany to Orewa! Time on lessons learned from previous projects and take those learnings forward.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell off to developers. Not used and costing us.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



We need the funds for 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:

Funds are needed now. We can't keep hitting rate payers.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

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 for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what 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>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> |



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Not Important |
|--|---------------|



#953



| | |
|---|------------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Keep building cycle ways !! Make it safe for cyclists- both children getting to school and adults commuting- get as many cars out of the city and off motorways. More bus lanes (silverdale especially)

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport routes

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

More lanes on motorway - 2nd harbour crossing

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It's a great place for a stadium - close to Albany and motorway. Sports parks/ green space are important especially in Albany with all the instenvie housing. Use it for concerts - entice the blues/warriors/phoenix to play there once a season. Keep it! Rather than build another new stadium on the waterfront - fix what we already have

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

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?



#966



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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> | |



| | |
|---|--|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#966



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Look after what we have, get our people walking and cycling safely around

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Fewer speed humps and cycle lanes. Events should fund themselves.



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?

Make public transport cheaper

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The stadium could be used much more, so I'd be in favour of keeping it and changing the management as bulldozing it seems counter-productive for the community. However, the cost of this should not be unreasonable.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

I'd be inclined to keep some council ownership of the airport to keep them honest. As a major asset the public should have a say in how the airport operates.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Makes sense to share the risk and return but maintain overall control.

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?



#972



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <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>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>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> | |



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#972



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Review need for highly paid staff (paid over 150k). Move all pensions for council staff (including elected members) to be in line with private sector.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Efficient transport is important for a productive city.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Review and benchmark all contracts so it is clear that we are getting best value for money.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Doesn't directly affect me.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Time to let professionals manage these.



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#982



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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> |



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#982



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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> |



#993



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <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>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>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>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> |



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Not Important |



| | |
|---|------------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Pedestrian crossings. More cost effective options looked at.

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:

I don't believe the council should sell anymore shares in AIAL. I think it's in the vested interest of Aucklanders to be shareholders in the Airport.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#1011



Tell us here:

Either way there will have to be an investment into infrastructure to support the port. As long as the leasing as promised, delivers a higher return than the POAL then yes.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#1011



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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, | I don't know |



#1011



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped | Not Important |



#1011



| | |
|---|----------------|
| reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#1027



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 |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted 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 |



#1027



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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> |



#1027



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Not Important |



#1027



| | |
|---|----------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Under utilized and poor value for money. Auckland already has too many large stadiums.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#1044



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
|---|-----------------------|



#1044



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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></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> |



#1044



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#1044



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Transport | |
| Water | |
| City and local development | |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:



#1052



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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>Resume the Water Quality Targeted 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> | |



#1052



| | |
|--|--|
| <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?



#1052



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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



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, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#1055



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 |



#1055



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |



#1055



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Not Important |



#1055



| | |
|---|---------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | 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 or stop spending on cultural events and Maorification.



#1079



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Some people rely on their vehicles for work purposes. I am in an itinerant job. public transport often requires more time, as getting to some places requires catching several buses.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Carbon emissions.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

This might make the use more efficient.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

This will enhance cash returns to the council to help pay for services.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#1079



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 upfront payment can help to reduce rates increases.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Future fund does not interest me so much, as I am old. The young progressives can solve their own future problems.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

No impact on the operations at the port.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#1079



It will help to reduce road transport of goods.

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>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>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p> | |



#1079



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

Upper Harbour

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | Not Important |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | Not Important |



#1079



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | Not Important |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | Fairly Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | I don't know |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | Very Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Albany has a functional library. Ethnic people's plan suggests we are not all equal - all just New Zealanders. This country was founded on Western world culture.

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I can't find page 128, so no opinion.

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

None of the above



#1079



Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

No

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | 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?

Review CV on houses - out of whack with current state

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

parks, road crossings



#1086



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?

light rail

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:



#1086



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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



#1086



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>Do not support</p> |



#1086



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Not Important |



#1086



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

greater empahsis needed on transport

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Absolutely not paying more. Need efficiency not waste.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Anything not directly related to health, safety and security of the people.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

The biggest issue is the lack of skills in Auckland Transport. The planning or lack thereof and the waste.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell the stadium and land it is not necessary for the health, safety or security of Auckland.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell the assets sorry I mean liabilities

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Other

Tell us here:

Sell the assets sorry I mean liabilities

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Sell 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?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell them

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell it



#1103



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>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>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> | |



#1103



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | 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?

Need to change the whole rasting taxation aystem to reflect the services people actually use not the size of their property.

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
|---|------------------|



#1103



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Need to reduce costs and get back to basics. If it doesn't maintain/improve basic health , safety or security cancel it.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Need to reduce costs and get back to basics. If it doesn't maintain/improve basic health , safety or security cancel it.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Fire the roading idiots who can't organise a party in a pub.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1121



Get rid of the revenue generating cameras in nonsensical locations such as the lower end of Khyber Pass Road, it is poorly marked and makes far too much revenue to be anything but a means to offside your rates paying citizens.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

AT will never succeed while it completely ignores the wishes and mannerisms of the citizenry they are meant to serve, most Aucklanders react well to park and ride express services down major arterials, concentrate on the successful options like this and stop the silliness.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised pedestrian crossings - if you have an idiot driver who is going too fast he's not going to suddenly stop because of a raised crossing, and you see the pedestrian expectation that every car is 100% guaranteed going to stop - a bad mixture of preconceptions that will end in tragedy.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

This is underutilised land with a growing land demand of encroaching housing and retail, sell what's not required to deliver community sport to finance the upkeep.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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:



#1121



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>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> | |



#1121



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#1121



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Water delivery & waste water. Taking back Watercare & transport, these companies are making a profit, it is not in council pockets so lost income & higher costs for users.

Rail to wider Auckland with proper parking at each site, multilevel.



#1129



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Where are all the cuts to wasteful spending that Wayne Brown was going to do.

I think just like the above breakdown each sub item should have a Do less, As proposed, Do more vote. Do what the people want.

I think also an option of a blanket 4% increase over 4-5yrs would be more accepted & the ability to do more.

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?

Other

Tell us why:

Until there is a rail option the roading around the stadium does not support big events.

Demolishing it & rebuilding should not be undertaken. Do not rebuild. It would be better to have an indoor community/events/sports facility built in it place.

Currently not a priority of spending.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#1129



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Support establishment of a future fund but not by selling off airport shares.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Sell off a 10% share of 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

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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?



#1129



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>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>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> |



#1129



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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. | 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?

These changes should be listed and the ability to click support or don't offered.

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#1129



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | I don't know |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Spend less on sports venues and the like



#1143



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I used to use the public buses to get to the City and Takapuna. There were too many transfers for Takapuna. The old system (1990s?) where some Auckland buses went through Takapuna without the need to transfer were far superior!

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Sports venues and cycle ways.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I do not favour spending vast amounts of our hard earned cash on sports especially the North Harbour Stadium and cycleways

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 am undecided about the ownership of our ports and wharves. At the least the Council should own a controlling share.



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

I am undecided about the ownership of our ports and wharves. At the least the Council should own a controlling share.

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:

Stop rampant development of farmland for houses and commercial use. Maintain significant greenbelts around and within the city. Reduce rates on those properties that go to form greenbelts.

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:



#1143



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>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> | <p></p> |



#1143



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#1143



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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?



#1158



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cycleways and raised crossings are important for safety and the environment, so should not be reduced.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Depends on what the redevelopment options are. I don't think we need more apartments with shops underneath which we are struggling to fill. More housing (apartments), but they need to be affordable, not \$1m+ or little studios.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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



#1158



Tell us 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:

Again, not overpriced apartments with shops below that sit empty.

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



#1158



| | |
|--|---------|
| <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> | 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> | 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 |



#1158



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



#1158



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I support them. I don't know if this is part of your area, but more direct bus services for Torbay/Browns BAY to Albany bus station would be good

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | |
| Water | |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#1184



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

stopping some previously-planned initiatives, such as some raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways. - The cost of raising pedestrian crossing verses painting white lines and some curb work (dissabled access)

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

i would need to know more about the change in operational mangement verses redevelopment? not enough info

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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 dont know enough of the detail, however If the fund is established there would need to be clear agreement as to what the fund would be used for and the decision making process would need to be publicicly available (transparent) since the fund belongs to the people and a proper mechanisim for ensuring a sound rational decision making process and accountability of decision makers to the public at large.



#1184



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Retain underlying council ownership, BUT- re-organise group operation team to include entrepreneurial thinkers and not just bean counters. Possibly profit share with the group operational team as incentive to really make the asset return on capital. Put in place accountability measures to ensure sound rational based decisions and make this accessible to the public to a point. Lets not forget if council decides to lease out operational management, whoever takes that on is going into it on the basis of profit and the fastest way to recoup profit is to reduce access or services and then put some window dressing up to make it look good and spin a yarn!

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:

split the profits between council services 70% and future fund 30%

4d. Do you have 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:



#1184



not enough information to make an appropriate comment. Complex at best and project future returns on hypotheticals can be a waste of time.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

not enough information to make an appropriate comment. Complex at best and project future returns on hypotheticals can be a waste of time.

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.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#1184



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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?

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?

I support most priorities



#1184



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Take OUT all speed bumps and raised pedestrian crossings as they have caused more harm than good. Doesn't allow rainfall to get to drains easily

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycleways

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Build more stands and make it like eden park. amke more use of it for concerts and for north shore peolpe

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Leave the shares in aial and ports of auckland alone. you get good dividends out of it that can be used to the good of all auckland

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#1198



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Good return on money and for the good of auckland and all of new zealand as it would make cheaper freight costs

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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:

everything else has been taken - LEAVE IT ALONE

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#1198



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>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> |



#1198



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Not Important |



#1198



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

we haven't got the money

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

haven't got the money

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | Do 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, Should look at any increases only after the OCR normalises

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1202



Local development. Auckland council should to charge rates not only according to property CV but also individual income

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Capped transport cost only good for people who can use public transport. Dynamic lanes are not useful until the current laws are better defined to ensure better traffic control - driving slow on the outer lanes; min speed on motorway etc., Cycleways seems to be a huge waste of money

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

connecting public transport from every suburb to all major work areas - Hibrook business park, airport oaks etc

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Not to engage in new plans that would cost more to the taxpayers while our economy is in a major turmoil with rising interest rates, cost of living and now brain drain

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

There are bigger priorities than spending 33 millions on a 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



#1202



Tell us why:

Using taxpayers money for such a huge investment. This is likely to cause more distress to travelers than benefits

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#1202



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>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>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>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>Support</p> |



#1202



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#1206

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#1206



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?



#1206



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>Support</p> |



#1206



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Other |
| 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. | 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?



#1206



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?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | I don't know |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |



#1206



Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Not Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | 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 I doubt I'd see any change anyway

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1210



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

why not

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Street Light maintenance

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

It's an important feature of the North Shore

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:



#1210



Ports of AKL should be moved away from the CBD waterfront to a less attractive site

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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> |
|--|----------------|



#1210



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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, | Do not support |



#1210



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped | Fairly Important |



#1210



| | |
|---|----------------|
| reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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?



#1214



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:

Currently a white elephant - something needs doing, the idea of selling 'some' of the land makes sense and make the stadium less capacity to c 8,000 proposed -with 'option' to increase where certain events mean capacity uplift is required.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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:



#1214



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> |
|---|----------------|



#1214



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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>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> |



#1214



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#1214



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | As 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 transport infrastructure for North Shore

More community services spreading evenly across the City

More events that generate financial benefit for the city



#1217



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less regulations, lean management system

Less cycleways as not provide benefits for majorities and costly

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

We need more facilities around the stadium, and more events to generate income from the stadium.

Northshore need a stadium, not more shoebox houses.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Setup the fund, but need to keep AIAL shares.



#1217



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 lease will cause pain in long term run, just a short sight benefit.

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:

Split between council services and topup Future Fund

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

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



#1217



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 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>Other</p> |



#1217



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#1217



| | |
|---|----------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Public transport

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1220



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Improved cycleways are a necessary part of city infra - it's active transport that inceases wellbeing and takes cars off the road and load off of public transport

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

public and active transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Honestly unsure about this but worth considering options

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know



#1220



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Spend on active and public transport, it's an investment for the present and the future

4d. Do you have 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

Support



#1220



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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). | 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. | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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, | Support |



#1220



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped | Fairly Important |



#1220



| | |
|---|------------------|
| reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?

expensive art/sculptures around Auckland are not required. Reduce meetings, consultations and huge cost associated with that.



#1227



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?

Better investment in road surfaces so they don't erode so quickly.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Bikeways are unnecessary cost as I don't feel the cost/benefit value is there. Not enough people actually use them.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It seems to be unused alot of the time, I'm sure it could be used more frequently

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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?



#1227



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#1227



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | Support |



#1227



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



#1227



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

nothing. council has failed to manage budget across all projects. would not trust council with any more of my money. Do the basics until the council books float above deficit.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



do less of all things.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

any projects involving AT will fundamentally overspent and under-deliver.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

do not spend any more money making things look or feel nice. how much revenue does the north shore stadium generate vs cost to maintain per year? if the numbers don't stack up, do what any investment projects would do and exit.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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?



#1232



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

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



#1232



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | Do not 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> | 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 |



#1232



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |



#1232



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Build a downtown stadium fit for purpose and ideally with a roof closing option enabling us to re purpose eden park and its land for other purposes, and complete a second harbour crossing via tunnel. Also a focus on improving and expanding major highways, routes and motorways around Auckland should be another focus.



#1233



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Spend money on consultants and stop thinking short term but plan major long term projects.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I agree with stopping raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways, but we need to focus on building more dedicated bus ways and improving our motorway and highway networks as well as building a second underground harbour crossing.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Motorways and road networks, also parking at bus stations

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

public transport for things like walking and cycling.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

North Harbour stadium is no longer fit for purpose so re purpose and build a smaller stadium and focus on building a proper downtown stadium that can be a major draw for sporting, musical and other events.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#1233



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:

4d. Do you have 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



#1233



Tell us why:

We need a downtown stadium so use that port to build a stadium.

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> | 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> | 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> | 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> | Do not support |



#1233



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#1233



| | |
|---|------------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | 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?

stop the food scraps collection. It's wildly expensive and we can compost at home. We should be able to opt-out and accomplish the same benefits. We need to incentivise distributed solutions like planting our own trees and doing our own composting



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

none of my feedback was incorporated in the AT plan. AT is hostile to disabled patrons and actively incentivises putting more cars on the road. We need a new harbour crossing, please stop wasting money deliberately making public transportation worse.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

harbour bridge crossing

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

public transport, it's been actively getting worse, and disabled patrons may as well go ***** themselves

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

don't care

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



along with composting at home, we need to incentivise distributed initiatives. Property owners can plant trees like pōhutukawa to prevent slips, while also revitalising native ecology and restoring habitats

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

in favour of leasing, but 35 years is a very long time, a lot could change

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:

compound interest, we need to invest in ourselves

4d. Do you have 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



#1239



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 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>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>Do not support</p> |
| <p>Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p> | |



#1239



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

stop the food scraps collection. It's wildly expensive and we can compost at home. We should be able to opt-out and accomplish the same benefits. We need to incentivise distributed solutions like planting our own trees and doing our own composting

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#1239



| | |
|---|------------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

I don't trust you to create greenways. You can't even get a proper harbour crossing after all these years. Auckland Transport went to *****, you may as well be actively discriminating against disabled people. What I want is to have small targeted eff

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Right now I am paying a lot and our services are decreasing. The current proposal involves a 20.16% increase in rates over the next 3 years, and the 'do more' proposal is a 37.94% increase. I think a 20.16% increase should be more than enough to 'do more' rather than continuing to cut services. I'd prefer more spent on the day-to-day life of actual residents of our city, particularly public transport.



#1241



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

I would prefer less spent on major events funding. I'd prefer to not pay for the compost bin as I can make my own at home.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Previously-planned initiatives shouldn't be stopped if they are going to benefit our citizens in the long term. Park and rides should not be charged as the feeder buses are not at all optimised, it's impossible for most residents in an area to get to a park and ride using public transport.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Subsidising or reducing public transport costs for users. Public transport will never be the preferred mode of transport unless it is faster and more cost-effective than driving (which it currently isn't).

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Anything that would mean the cost for users would increase.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It's always empty.



#1241



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Investing in Auckland's future is better by improving infrastructure and networks. I don't know enough about this to answer properly.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

This option benefits our citizens more by lessening the blow of increased rates in a Cost of Living crisis, and would mean that long-term improvements can be made quicker.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know



#1241



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:

We are a harbour city without any functional/reliable ferry service. This should be used for 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. | 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 | Support |



#1241



| | |
|---|--------------|
| businesses and raises the share paid 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. | 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?

Lots of these aren't explained in the document so I don't know.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays



#1241



Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why



#1241



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

They're okay but I would prefer to see more emphasis on public transport improvements, especially for the Whangaparaoa peninsula.

8. Do you have any other comments?

As most people will think, I don't mind paying more in rates as long as I see some sort of benefit for myself. Currently I haven't experienced any benefits after moving into a first home and starting to pay rates - in fact all I've experienced is reduced bus/ferry routes, reserves and green spaces being bought up for development, amenities being taken away from parks, a lack of parking at our local park-n-ride, endless traffic cones and potholes, and more. If the council shows they are using our money for actual improvements, I'm sure people will be happier with the rates increase proposals. Small things make a big difference, and if only the budget cuts are being discussed on the local Facebook community page, it creates a really negative vibe in the community. No one is receptive to change if we are already resistant. It would be worth working with local councillors to boost morale and provide visible and obvious improvements, and listen to what each area is complaining about. The local boards are huge and the proposals don't consider ever local grievance.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?



#1247



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#1247



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 |



#1247



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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> | I don't know |



#1247



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and | Fairly Important |



#1247



| | |
|---|---------------|
| other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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?



#1271

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



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:



#1271



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
|---|-----------------------|



#1271



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |
| <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> |



#1271



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



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:

I feel that this is the first step in 'carving out' assets for future sale. If this is potential option in the next ten years than this should be made clear.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#1275



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:

Concerns around the Auckland Future Fund, understanding the intent but how it would be managed practically and what tangible future benefits. With out clarity I would prefer this to be spent on council activities and services.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

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> |
|---|----------------|



#1275



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>Do not support</p> |



#1275



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#1275



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

fix poor stae of the roads only

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1278

Wasting money on consultants level of ticket clipping on council projects is crazy, get better value for money from suppliers and contractors

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

wasting money on raised pedestrian crossings, when they worked before, which causes back logs, as trucks have to slow down excessively,

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

cleaning up the city mowing berms that are unkempt, weeds in round about etc making the harbor bridge all weather , or get rid of the risk averse twits managing it

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

slowing down traffic

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is,Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It was used more often for events before super city took over now it s seems Auckland council only have deep pockets for projects in the CBD

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



#1278



Tell us why:

little return from these shares

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

poor returns in private ownership it would be run more efficiently

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

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:

be nice to have more public space on the water

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#1278



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. | 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. | 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). | 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. | 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 | Support |



#1278



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

rather rates funded refuse collection of general rubbish stopped every where turn it to user pays

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#1278



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | I don't know |
| 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. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | I don't know |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

no mention of how this will be implemented sounds like PR waffle to me

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

pass

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



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?



#1283



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>Support</p> |



#1283



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?



#1283



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off | Fairly Important |



#1283



road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Stick to Road Rubbish Parks Libraries Dog Control

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Dump the cultural stuff. Stop competing with private business.



#1287



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell the stadium and use the land for housing.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell AIA shares and use the funds for improving replacing infrastructure.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:



#1287



Move the Port to Thames and sell the land for development commercial and residential.

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:

See above. Move the Port and sell the land.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell to a private operator for use by cruise ships.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell to a private operator.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#1287



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | Support |



#1287



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | Do 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?



#1301



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#1301



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. | 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 |



#1301



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | Do not support |



#1301



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



#1301



| | |
|---|----------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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?

The Local Boards are our direct contact with council and make a difference in our areas and lives. Direct more funding here. Let us at least feel we get something for our rates



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the inflated numbers of overpaid staff as promised by Mr Brown as part of his election promise



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Until the excess staff are reduced and inflated works costs are addressed we will continue to pay excessive rates on our fixed incomes

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Excessive staff numbers and more cost effective construction costs

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:

Provided it results in reduced cost to ratepayers

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#1323



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Anything that reduces rates is beneficial to those on fixed income, it is becoming obvious that council “ empires” have no intention of streamlining into more efficient departments

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Out of control spending by unelected beaurocrats remains the fundamental issue , so much for economies of scale

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Cut waste and cut staff numbers

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:

At least some cost benefit is achieved at present and no doubt a vanity project with associated costs would result on other options

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#1323



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

See previous comment

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. | 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 | Support |



#1323



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#1323



| | |
|---|------------------|
| community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Limited funds do not allow for many vanity nice to have projects

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?

There seems to be no accountability for CCOs who continue to spend without thought for the ratepayers who fund their jobs/organisations , they seem to be away for councillors to deny accountability



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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 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?

Stop wasting money on expensive pedestrian crossings, Expensive projects need more pier review.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Park and ride car parks are too small, SH1 upgrade to the city should have been 3 lanes all the way south, too many houses around the Silverdale area increasing traffic.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Roads, flooding.

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 continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#1324



Tell us 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

Do not support



#1324



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Support |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#1324



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Watercare NOT to give 5% of capitol expenditure to Maori and Pacifica owned companies by 2025!!!!



#1355



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

There has been No future Planning, No consultation, Too many beurocrats

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycleways, Raised crossings, Traffic light systems, Staff!!!!

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Consult with the North Shore community

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Planning for the future should have been previously done. Paid enough for reports!

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#1355



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 something because of an "Estimate", another cost for a report that is not justified

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Don't fix what isn't broken

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Don't depend on "estimates" that can't be justified.

Save on Consultant reports!

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

Consult with the public and not councilors who are "Out of touch" and have their own agenda

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other



#1355



Tell us why:

Consult with the public and not councilors who are "Out of touch" and have their own agenda

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. | Other |
| Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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. | 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 | Support |



#1355



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#1355



| | |
|---|------------------|
| community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Don't understand that Mana Whenua have to be consulted separately (Are they not part of the community at large!)

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Seek community approval

8. Do you have any other comments?

Stop paying percentage of expenditure to Maori and Pacifica Owned companies of 5% by 2025. by council entities (Racist to say the least)



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I would be prepared to pay more only if Auckland Council can show they don't waste Rate Payers' money.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1358



Auckland Council should think outside square and incorporate with stakeholders worldwide to develop Auckland, not only relaying on rates.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland Council has failed for the past decades. The more Auckland Council implemented improvements, the worse the traffic got. We have lost confidence in the Auckland Council for managing Auckland Transportation.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

You don't need to spend more money. Go to see examples in major cities worldwide and learn what to do to manage city transportation. You can simply regulate the heavy vehicles not to use the road in rush hours to improve traffic by far.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

You should spend less on everything. Use your common sense.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

It's working ok. Not your 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



#1358



Tell us why:

Good to think ahead.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Obvious.

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:

Obvious.

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?



#1358



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 we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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. | 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 |



#1358



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

No.

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our | Not Important |
|--|---------------|



#1358



| | |
|---|------------------|
| community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Always have good plans. We want to see outcomes and just plans.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#1379



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> |



#1379



| | |
|---|----------------|
| harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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. | 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 |



#1379



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | 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?



#1392



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Fuel taxes. So many taxes.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

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:



#1392



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>Do not support</p> |
|---|-----------------------|



#1392



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |



#1392



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#1392



| | |
|---|----------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



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?



#1394



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> |



#1394



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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 |



#1394



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Very Important |



#1394



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.

Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Very Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Higher development fees for developers and people doing subdivisions, higher rates for AirBnB

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1397



Less staff overall, esp. Less communication staff and cut down management at Auckland Transport

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Need more value for money, AT should always use most cost effective solutions, too much money for luxury things

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Need a stadium in the Nortshore, but use it better

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#1397



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#1397



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> | |



#1397



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#1397



| | |
|---|----------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 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?

restoration of the Beach/Sea wall at Browns Bay Beach

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1433



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

things like raised pedestrian crossings, bus lanes, cycle ways seem like a luxury we cant afford. We are spending too much on these types of things for a minority. The Rothesay Bay shops are still really dangerous. The buses only support a small number of commuters.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Rothesay Bay shops need speed bumps. Reinstate some rubbish bins in the parks.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

traffic management/cones, raised pedestrian crossings, bus lanes, and cycle ways.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It is a huge development which simply is not utilised.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#1433



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

good way to make money for the city

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

I think its a big investment that we cannot afford (to develop these wharves) - there are plenty of other public spaces

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#1433



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>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> |



#1433



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#1433



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Water is a priority - upgrading infrastructure that will impact wastewater run off into streams and oceans, and protects our beaches and blue spaces which are a vital health and well being aspect of living in Auckland. Water should be protected and I



#1436



would happily pay more in my rates if it mean that cleaning up Auckland's water infrastructure.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Keep the stadium as a significant community resource for the North Shore. Actively look at promoting this venue (that used to be better utilised in previous years that it currently is) as a conference space, sports venue, concert venue, space for shows and fairs..

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#1436



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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?



#1436



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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> | |



#1436



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#1436



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | 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?

Future housing development to support immigration should be funded by Government. We require a fair share of GST raised in the area to be paid to AC to fund infrastructure.



#1442



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?

An additional bridge crossing of the harbour for PT, walk and cycle.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Excessive temporary traffic management for road works.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

The stadium is underused and the land could support more apartments, schools and PT

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

A professionally managed AFF can act like a sovereign wealth fund and generate asset growth. This would strengthen the AC balance sheet and help with emergencies, flooding, tsunami and dry weather events.



#1442



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Ownership and operation should remain in Kiwi hands not overseas

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:

These two wharves can provide for a cruise ship terminal and more public space and a Bus Interchange.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#1442



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. | 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 | |



#1442



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
|---|------------------|



#1442



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

I support increased walk and cycle networks and would like to see more funding for pest removal and stream restoration

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?

It is really important that Central Government assist AC with capex and infrastructure by way of a share of GST raised in the area. Stresses due to increasing immigration requiring transport, housing, water etc should be funded out of a GST fund.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Only significant stadium for a large part of Auckland

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us 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:



#1450



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 |



#1450



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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 |



#1450



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



#1450



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.

Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Very Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 support to organisations supporting the poor/low income sections of our city.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Less spend on roads.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Better, faster public transport has the added advantage of reduced traffic congestion with reduced need for road expenditure.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More on cycleways. Gets cars off the roads when people feel safe to cycle.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Less on road cones. :-)

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It should be possible for the stadium to make money rather than cost money.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Diversity of investment if well managed avoids major unexpected losses.



#1461



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

It would give more reliability for port development.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Diversity of investment is a good strategy.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Council is big enough to avoid giving profit from insurance management to an insurance company.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

The central waterfront should be a major tourist and resident feature of the city.



#1461



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:

Optimise the use of the waterfront as an Auckland city feature.

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. | Support |



#1461



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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?

Nil

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?

I support all priorities



#1461



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

All proposals enhance the community wellbeing.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Good, especially advocating for climate change education, advice and support.



#1461



8. Do you have any other comments?

Equitable funding for local boards should be introduced as quickly as is practicable.

Don't let trade off decisions cause inefficiency for projects.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce funding of cultural events



#1467



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?

Obtain a specialist pothole repairs machinery that can be operated by a division of the council to lessen the reliance on contractors ,which would save money.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

removal of the totally unnecessary safety requirements for minor road and pavement maintenance . ie two trucks with flashing lights to isolate one man weedeating a berm

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The population of the Northshore is greater than Wellington or Dunedin and future growth will require this facility to be available and utilised to service the growing 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)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

With the provision that the proposed funds return a substantially greater financial



#1467



reward .

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 possibility that a foreign corporation could control the port is unsettling and may lead to conditions that are at odds with the Auckland ratepayers.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

It equates to less debt required to provide basic council services.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Ownership of all port land should remain with Auckland,

Self insurance is a proposal worth consideration.

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 needs revenue over the need for public benefit whatever that may be.



#1467



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Revenue same as above.

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>Do not support</p> |



#1467



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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. | 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?

Pay as you use for the rubbish collection is fair and equitable.

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?

I support most priorities



#1467



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Council needs to get back to basics ,festivals and cultural event are costly,and how can we afford them ?

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

It has worthwhile goals, Providing greater debt is not incurred.



#1467



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?

Public transport and not just spend on roading system

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Roading infrastructure

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need to invest in better public transport

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Environmental protection and climate change mitigation

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roading and administration

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

We don't want to lose it but it definitely need more community 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)?

Other

Tell us why:

Keep the Airport once we sell it the long term it end up costing us more to use.
Capitalism will make sure of that



#1484



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Auckland infrastructure needs more investment as we grow

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Much more protection of the environment and climate impact mitigation

Disaster management planning

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Better use for the public and city



#1484



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 we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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. | 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 | Support |



#1484



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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. | |

6b. Do you have 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#1484



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

They are all priorities for the community and much needed

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Good



#1484



8. Do you have any other comments?

Environmental protection and community engagement are vital along with disaster management



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

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?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#1577



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> |



#1577



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>Do not 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>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> |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#1577



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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |



#1577



Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

1. Stop building speed bumps, expensive pedestrian crossings & forget cycle lanes. You need to at least recognise that Auckland has a hilly geography that most people



#1587



can't traverse on a bike and families with small children will never use. Buses don't service all parts of Auckland so cars will always be necessary.

2. The Long Term Plan is too focused on Maori and does not take into account that the majority of ratepayers are of different ethnicities.

3. STOP referring to Auckland as Tamaki Makaurau. Council has never canvassed its citizens and ratepayers on changing the name of our city. If you conducted a referendum on this it would overwhelmingly reject a change in the name.

4. Close down those CCOs that have become fiefdoms with their own bureaucracies and cost structures. Most of them do their own thing and have become unaccountable for their decisions.

5. STOP spending \$3million on Maori issues - they have no preferential rights than Aucklanders of other ethnicities. Everything race-based must be stopped. It attacks the basic tenets of democracy.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

The money wasted by AT on speed bumps, pedestrian crossings, bus lanes, cycle ways and reducing the road lanes to single vehicle ignores the needs of most Aucklanders. The example that stands out is the Forest Hill Rd crossings and traffic lights that are an absolute overkill that has adversely impacted traffic flow on that part of North Shore.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Reduce the staff numbers, reduce the salaries and terminate the building leases that are costing ratepayers a fortune. Parkinson's Law obviously has applied when AT occupies a whole building (the old Vodafone building that I used to work in) because it obviously has more staff than the work justifies.



#1587



3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The current stadium and stadium footprint should remain, because it was largely fundraised, developed and managed by North Shore people and that legacy should be cherished.

The mayor's proposal would be "the kiss of death" for North Harbour Stadium, which would no longer attract international events due to inept management over recent years.

We need a fit for purpose stadium and precinct that suits a variety of sports, community use and concerts.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

It makes more sense than having councillors who have no or very little commercial nous make investment decisions.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#1587



POA squandered millions of dollars on the container carrier automation project because they were allowed to make the investment without doing their homework and were incompetent at project management. Auckland Council didn't exercise true governance. They were:

1. responsible for setting strategy & overseeing management
2. legally required to act in the best interests of the council
3. legally liable for its actions
4. ultimately responsible for the success of the company,
5. expected to supervise the business, not run it
6. pass company resolutions that generate benefits to the shareholder, Auckland Council.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Has better focus on the strategy and long term plan

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Better use of those facilities would accrue if their use was targeted at activities that benefit Aucklanders and visitors



#1587



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

We don't want increases in truck and rail transport.

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. | Do not support |
| Re-introduce recycling charges for schools. | Support |



#1587



| | |
|---|---------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#1587



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Local people want to get involved in looking after our local areas (in my case Gulf Harbour). We want to be involved in monitoring flood risks, storm damage, and provide feedback to Council.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Need to see more detail in the budget



#1587



8. Do you have any other comments?

I have been a proud Aucklander for more than 82 years and am deeply concerned at the end result of the Super City formation. Our council has been poorly led for years and I have no confidence in many of the councillors due to their lack of business experience and governance capability. The way they get elected is so ridiculous that we end up with a mayor who has the ability and the where withall to change the way things are done but he is hampered by left-leaning councillors who can't or won't see the big picture. The booklet with bios that is circulated to voters is a joke - it's what they say about themselves and not about their proven capabilities and achievements. Another system is needed that voters can get a realistic picture of what each person brings to the role. All contenders should have references from third parties and be effectively vetted before they are put up for election.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1594



Stop slowing down the city with judder bars closing roads and pet projects to make things pretty. Get back to basics roads water waste water

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I don't support the push on public transport because it only applies to the minority not the majority

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Making the motorway at least 3 lanes from Orewa to Bombay

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised crossings cycle lanes

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Why spend money on something that is not essential

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#1594



So dictator mayors like the one we have now can't just sell off assets then rob the ratepayers with rises like he is trying to do

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Because the port will be leased to the highest bidder then all the costs will be passed on to the consumers. So the cost will be with us

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

So we can considerate on core needs

4d. Do you have 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?



#1594



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 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> |



#1594



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#1594



| | |
|---|------------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

We need to protect our coastline and green zones

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Less consultants. Run the council like a real business. Friends who work there say everything is slow and unproductive.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Speed bumps. Arts.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

No speed bump crossings. Less city bus lanes. .

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Bus network

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Pointless road safety initiatives.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell. We don't need it. I've never been there.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:



#1621



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Run the ports more efficiently.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

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:



#1621



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>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> | |



#1621



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Not Important |



#1621



| | |
|---|---------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Why do we waste money on regional boards.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Feel good initiatives with no actual benefits

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#1622



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> |



#1622



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?



#1622



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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |



#1622



Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Very Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know



#1636



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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> |



#1636



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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. | 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?



#1636



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?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | I don't know |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |



#1636



Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Fairly Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Establish an additional form of transport corridor on top of the current harbor bridge.
Improve the NX/WX bus lines to make them complete BRT systems, or establish light rail lines from city centre to the north shore (Albany) for a more stable public transport system.



#1646



1d. Is there anything else 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:

We need an improvement on the transport network as well as the public transport system.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

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?



#1646



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?

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

Do not support



#1646



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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. | 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 |



#1646



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Upper Harbour

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined | |



#1646



| | |
|--|--|
| in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Increase funding for physically and mentally disabled kiwis. Increase funding for more mental health help for younger kiwis.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1648



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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:



#1648



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. | 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 | I don't know |



#1648



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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>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> |



#1648



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays,Rodney

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Very Important |



#1648



| | |
|---|------------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Very Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Very Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Very Important |



#1648



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Very Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Very Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Very Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Very Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Silverdale (Rodney End)

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1657



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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:



#1657



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 |



#1657



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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 |



#1657



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | I don't know |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | I don't know |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Very Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Very Important |



#1657



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Fairly Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | I don't know |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Not from the Rodney area

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

To keep East Coast Bays especially Long Bay keeping it clean, all the trees and shrubs trimmed regularly

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1661



For e.g. new sub-division Auckland Council shouldn't have to pay for any road damages - housing developers should be paying for damages caused by their trucks and builders

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I don't mind paying for fuel tax to maintain our roads

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Maintain roads - less potholes

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:

This stadium is under utilised and we have many international cricket games that only can be played down the country and Eden Park.

Why not redevelop to cater for both cricket, rugby, league and even concerts.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#1661



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#1661



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>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura 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> | |



#1661



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

As ratepayer, if we are supporting these changes and rising rates - we want to see these fund are visibility showing in Auckland Council books

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
|---|---------------|



#1661



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Please dont build anymore those bumps around Auckland. It is really ridiculous having them in some places really not appropriate! Studies might be good in some countries but perhaps not applicable to New Zealand roads.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Its ok.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Bring back public park rubbish bins.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Maintain streets roads footpaths roundabouts not being overgrown and keep drains at an adequate state for drainage

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1666



No more cycle ways AT ALL they are out of hand;and use up space needed for cars
Limit community events and funding. Let the community organisations organise these.
Take away ward funding and use it from a central point to ensure value for money
Stop involvement in housing. Leave this to commercial and individuals

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Proposed plan is best option

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Getting rid of anything that slows traffic

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Anything that slows traffic should be stopped. Including judder bars and speed restrictions

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Let big business fund it It's not a core infrastructure requirement

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



#1666



Tell us why:

That's the only sensible option

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Best option

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:

Best

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Best



#1666



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:

Best

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>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>Support</p> |



#1666



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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?

No

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?

I do not support most priorities



#1666



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Local boards should Brie abolished. Coucilmlose control if funding and appropriate spend

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#1666



Not good

8. Do you have any other comments?

Keep the money central



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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



#1678



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

no

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

walking places

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:

more use 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:

Airport is not for a council

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#1678



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

no

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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

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:

no

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#1678



Tell us why:

no

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>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>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> |



#1678



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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. | |

6b. Do you have 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#1678



| | |
|---|------------------|
| community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

i walk a lot

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

god

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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?

1d. Is there anything else 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:

Better value for money could be obtained by improving prioritisation of spending.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Traffic signal optimisation. Traffic light cycles are sub optimal and lead to unnecessary delays, increased pollution and frustration - particularly during the evening and night periods.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised crossings and cycling lanes where there is no proven safety requirement.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Currently underutilised.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#1686



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#1686



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> | |



#1686



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#1686



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Not well defined as they lack detail

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



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, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#1713



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>Support</p> |



#1713



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#1713



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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |



#1713



Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Not Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



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:



#1717



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. | |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted 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 | |



#1717



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |



#1717



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

KEEP pay as you throw rubbish collection. Without it a household of 1 - 2 people will be subsidising larger families. A 80L bin for me is 6 weeks of refuse.

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |



#1717



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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?

If I got anywhere close to a percentage rise in my income as you are proposing, I'd be happy. BUT I don't and so are not happy with your proposal to increase rates. When you say average which you did last year of 7.5%. Mine was 10%



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | |
| 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?

As a Pensioner, I cannot afford to pay more than I am already paying, I am almost 80 years old. The Water Rates are starting to cause hard times for many Pensioners .And charging more for other plans that you people want yo set up with higher % will bankrupt many people on low incomes, sickness and Invalids Benefits along with the Pensioners. Pensioners these days are not rich. With your idea of Higher Rates I



#1730



suggest you pick on the rich People that have lots of money to throw around, not the poor people of this Country New Zealand.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

You should be doing one thing at a time and finishing it, before you go on to do the next plan, instead of all at once and stop attacking the people of the Public for higher rates in water and all other ideas.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

A new Harbor Bridge to carry the extra load of traffic.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Water Rates. Everyone deserves to have water on a low rate, one cannot survive without water.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Because I know of a lot of People that use the Stadium on a regular basis, especially the swimming pool to Teach themselves and their children from drowning in pools and beaches.



#1730



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Air fares are expensive enough already, if you want our people to travel around the world for education reasons and have a break from NZ you need to keep the prices down.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Because its like renting a House isn't it, you lease the wharfs etc to people coming and going especially overseas people who come into our country with lots of money, such as the Chinese... Then you will get some funds from doing the leasing..

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

You will get more willing people, to help fund the Council, logic isn't it.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#1730



My only remark would be keep prices that we already have down so that low earning people can cope with the cost of living at this present time while National is the Politics, they have to go so they can stop dictating to the Council and breaking promises they made about low income earners, Pensioners, etc:- I would like to see Luxton living off \$764.64 a fortnight, paying bills and health expenses.... we can't even save any money so we can have a decent life...

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

If you remove the two wharfs where are the containers on the ships coming in Port from overseas going to be put down. Don't forget everyone is expected to buy on line these days, while all the shops around NZ especially in Auckland are closing down,...
Th

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Use your brains, stop making life difficult for all New Zealanders. Help is needed here not putting costs up or taking away wharfs, Ports of Auckland.. Only the rich people would be the ones to side with the Council and the National Party, as they have loads of money up their sleeves.

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



#1730



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |
| <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>Do not support</p> |



#1730



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

Think about the older folk in all areas of NZ for a change who can't afford more high rates, fees in their lives, stop helping the Rich people of NZ. The Council to me is out of control.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

NO.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less regulation and CONTROL in all areas.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Pouring public money into public transport is a waste of time. Most of the day busses are empty, even the much vaunted northern busway is only used for a small period of the day and has made no difference to delays at all. Complete failure, let alone the enormous cost.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

All council wages and staff numbers. A major cull is required to get costs back under control.

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:

The current position is a failure, how much worse can it be.



#1734



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#1734



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other 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> | |



#1734



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#1734



| | |
|---|---------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

These are all well meaning ideas dreamed up by people used to wasting other peoples money with no thought to how the money is earned.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The same as above. Stop spending our money on fanciful ideas and get back to providing the basics. Roads, water, refuse disposal, and get out of everyones life.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Transport | |
| Water | |
| City and local development | |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Anything "woke" or aimed at cultural sensitivity, or giving additional rights to anyone based on sexuality or race, or trying to educate people about social matters (as this isn't actually the council's job!!).



#1739



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:



#1739



4d. Do you have 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> | |



#1739



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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?

Hibiscus and Bays,Rodney

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

There are a number of regions that still have unrepaired damage from the storms last January and February 2023. It is way overdue that these are fixed.

More should be done to cut traffic into and out of the city



#1750



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More emphasis on walkways and bicycle paths.

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:

Investment in the future is always a good thing and should be paid for by appropriate borrowing and funding. But a fund like this is apt to cause issues.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#1750



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:

The council should be able to "use for something else"

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Are you seriously thinking that Auckland will need less coming into the port. Coastal shipping is apt to grow as ground and air transport gets more expensive (carbon taxes etc)



#1750



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>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> |



#1750



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#1750



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Where is the repair and recovery from all the damage to coastal paths and beaches etc from the January 2023 storm?????

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do 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?

Purchase open green spaces

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1759



Bureaucracy

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Proposal is about spending more.

Consolidation should be target.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Most of the proposal.

Other items of plan are much more important

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Too difficult to understand.

Do not build vanity projects in the first place

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#1759



Tell us why:

Don't know

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

Don't know

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

Don't know

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:

Tourism is a very good earner. So future landscaped area is attractive for more tourists e.g

San Francisco



#1759



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:

Progress

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>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>Do not support</p> |



#1759



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

Consolidation and resilience are the key factors

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?

I support most priorities



#1759



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Consolidation and resilience of the current situation

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Don't know



#1759



8. Do you have any other comments?

Consolidation and resilience should be the key approaches. Not expansion into new 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | 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?

Future proofing: install solar panels on all large roof spaces (schools, hospitals, factories etc) and smaller spaces (on all bus stops as in the Netherlands; train stations and subsidies for people in poorer communities to fix solar panels on their roofs.



#1794



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Smaller more efficiently run council with fewer staff and less talk about climate change and more action to combat climate change. Stop propping up the petrol and diesel industry, and more incentives to make it easier for people to switch to electric cars, trucks and delivery vehicles. Spend less on roading and more on public infrastructure. Electric cars are now paying a large share of road usage due to new laws making this country possibly the only one in the world where petrol and diesel car owners are rewarded for keep polluting the atmosphere.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

The Fuel Tax was meant to be a disincentive to keep driving petrol and diesel cars. With its removal we are rewarding such polluting vehicles and with no subsidies or incentives to make it easier to switch to electric this country will lag behind the new technologies available overseas (Europe, China and Australia are far ahead). Electric cars are now paying a large share of road usage due to new laws making this country possibly the only one in the world where petrol and diesel car owners are rewarded for keep polluting the atmosphere.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More electric charge points and huge stops along motorways as seen in the UK and Europe for electric cars ONLY for recharging (no petrol pumps) but other services are available to anyone there. We should invest in public transport: build train lines for REGULAR passenger trains to all the major and medium sized towns as is the norm in Europe, to get cars off the road; invest in rail freight to get trucks off the road so roads don't deteriorate so fast. We need a rail link to the airport; we need trams back in the city and close-by suburbs. We need ferries from seaside suburbs to the city and across to other suburbs as in Sydney.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?



No more new petrol stations; no new roads; spend less on costly consultation and just get on with building public transport.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Consolidating large sporting events to the existing stadiums then put public transport in place for people to easier get to events, again, as in Europe!!

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

We need to invest in structures sooner than later: Auckland's population will continue to grow, so we're bottle necking at providing public transport while some roads are at a



#1794



standstill 4x a day now. Better to build structures now than invest and have these build later at greater cost.

4d. Do you have 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:

While it's always best to build more intensive housing, we cannot afford to loose the port then solve the problem by adding more trucks on the road. We all know from overseas experience: long traffic jams = economic suicide.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

We need a port for such a big city for imports and exports.

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 |



#1794



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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> | 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 |



#1794



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

More funds set aside to green the city: we should be planting many, many more trees in suburban shopping areas (like Browns Bay - trees have died, chopped off etc, and not replaced) to combat 'heated islands' within cities and suburbs.

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#1794



| | |
|---|----------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

We will back peddle if we don't try and at least keep up with damage caused by excessive heat and floods: big trees have died and not being replaced for example. We need to spend on greening our city and suburbs for both a cooling effect, and that roots a

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

More should be done to combat climate change: solar panels on large buildings such as schools, hospitals, libraries, warehouses and factories; encourage children to walk or cycle to school and not be driven there and back; more education on recycling in order to do this effectively.

8. Do you have any other comments?

We can save money by electrifying whole fleets of cars and not penalise electric car ownership (and by the same token rewarding the petrol and diesel industry); incentives for people (especially in poorer areas) to install solar panels on their roofs; making better use of water transportation by having more ferries. We need a train line to the airport.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#1796



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I would like to support spending more on measures to mitigate climate change

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More done to decarbonise our buses, trains and ferries

Improvements to Lincoln Rd and New Nort Rd

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:



#1796



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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



#1796



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> |



#1796



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Very Important |



#1796



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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?

SAVE more. I do not TRUST the council to control its spending. Control Auckland Transport. They WASTE money. You should not rely on rates to cover your waste. The plan does not show any specific commitment to SAVE and respect the rate payers money. You need to gain TRUST. This feed back process is DIFFICULT. All council areas should be clean, attractive to visitors and well cared for.



#1810



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less advertising. This document is difficult to follow and comment on. It appears expensive. Less waste. Control the building and maintenance processes so they cost LESS. Make Health and Safety efficient! Do NOT charge those using the bus for parking at Park and Ride. We will stop using the bus --- as seen in the UK!

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Transport is unreliable. NX1 NX2 is superb. Local buses are often empty. Reduce them. AT lack credibility. Why change HOP cards? Where will AT save money? Are they wasteful? Developers damage roads. Who pays for the repairs?

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Controlling the waste of AT! Show us the Council is efficient.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Empty buses. Probably the bureaucracy of AT. My opinion is that Auckland Council as an organisation wastes money. Spend less on the peripheral stuff and DO MORE.

All the road cones and traffic control appears unnecessary.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Ask the community. If the facility is not financially sensible then CHANGE. The swimming pool is probably well used and could be enhanced.



#1810



Look at a detailed calendar of how the stadium is used. Remember the expansion of Millwater and Milldale may increase demand?

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

As presented it makes financial sense. What will be the cost of actually managing the fund. The amount of money involved would make a very small percentage represent a lot of money. Do you have anyone you can TRUST? Find someone who actually CARES about Auckland! will it be a CCO? Do you manage CCOs appropriately?

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

I, we, have to TRUST you know what you are doing. As presented the Auckland Future Fund looks to be a good idea as does leasing the port. Can you trust your own figures? Will there be any accountability or will you just pass the buck and come back to the rate payers. We deserve a financial system we can trust.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

The figures you present are persuasive. You will need to CONTROL the intense social desires of some members of the council. If there is the view " we have the money we



#1810



should spend it --" the Auckland Future Fund will not work. You must maintain structures and services that work well BEFORE spending on new ventures which will also need to be maintained.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Can we TRUST your analysis? Have you scrutinised what your financial people have suggested to you. These people will have new jobs in 3, 5, 7 years and will walk away from any mal-decisions. Can you TRUST them? Can you control Auckland Transport and Watercare. Will you find an operator to lease the POA?

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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 appears financially sensible. Have you scrutinised the figures? Do you have a list of potential undesirable consequences? Will the salaries be sensible?

You must have a welcoming and up-market facility for cruise ships. The present dock looks awful

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The increase in road traffic should be avoided. The trains are probably a joke!

Port activity should increase so leave room for expansion and a vision for the future.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#1810



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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> | |



#1810



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

We need to encourage businesses. Do they get tax relief and GST relief? If so then some increase is acceptable. Why do you need so many "targeted" fees? Are you losing sight of the detail of the CORE council business? The loss of SAIL GP to Auckland was appalling! You knew it was coming and we have lost a lot of revenue. There is also the loss of other major events which attract visitors and thereby revenue for the city. You have made some serious errors.

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#1810



| | |
|---|------------------|
| community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | I don't know |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

A Clean, Tidy, Attractive environment is paramount. Visitors need to be impressed. They will then return and frequent local businesses. What is the LOCAL PLAN to increase revenue? ADVOCATING is all very well but it does not inspire confidence. What ar

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Not specific enough. All "advocacy". Where is swimming pool? Where is Health Care? Where is the VISION? Where is the entrepreneurial aspiration for the next 10 years? If I have missed it please tell me.



#1810



8. Do you have any other comments?

I cannot go back to page 19 to find out.

This whole process is, to me, difficult and not user friendly. I cannot stop and return later.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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?



#1841



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The North Harbour region is expanding its population like most other parts of Auckland. We need more parks & green areas. The stadium has been badly and possibly deliberately missed managed over the last few years to the gain of Eden park and Mt Smart stadium. I cannot believe the management has been so devoid of any ideas of how to run the stadium properly. South of the bridge has never like North Harbour having its own stadium since the day the idea was floated.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?



#1841



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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 | |



#1841



| | |
|---|--|
| 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?



#1841



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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?

Na

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Wasting money



#1848



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Public transport and cycleways should be the highest priority

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycle ways

Public transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roads

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Stadium is great it just needs to be used

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#1848



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#1848



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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 |



#1848



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



#1848



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | 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 or stop building speed bumps and traffic islands that provide no real additional safety such as those on oteha valley road and the oteha southbound on ramp.



#1851



Significant time, money and disruption for these. Have made traffic worse, with extremely low pedestrian use at both of these to warrant it

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Support the build of cycleways.

Do not support significant number of raised pedestrian crossings particularly those at traffic lights or low pedestrian volume. This seems excessive cost for no additional safety.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Seem to be very little events of greater public interest held there to make it financially viable.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#1851



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#1851



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>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> |



#1851



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Better council owned sporting facilities

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Anything to do with cultural things regardless of culture.

Less cycleways.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I like the public transport becoming faster

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Faster public transport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle ways don't get used and are a waste of money

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Current management isn't working

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#1861



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#1861



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> |



#1861



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Greener transportation efforts, including more electric busses, cycleways, and lightrail.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1862



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland has great transportation options, we just need more of it. More clean busses, more green options. Invest instead of capping! Paying is so easy compared to other metro transport systems. Dynamic lanes won't fix traffic problems.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Clean busses, light rail, cycleways -- clean alternatives to more driving that can be used by the public.

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:

With more development in that area (Silverdale, Millwater, etc) there will be more desire to hold events there. It's a great stadium that has been under-utilised, but it should remain to support the expanded interest.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#1862



Incredibly short-sighted and will be instantly regretted. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE keep some public interest in this public utility. Even at 11%, the public, via the Council, retains some say in what happens to the airport.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Again, selling would be very shortsighted, getting big money now and less later. The system makes a good profit and shouldn't be changed. Keep public assets public!

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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



#1862



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 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>Do not support</p> |



#1862



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Not Important |
|--|---------------|



#1862



| | |
|---|------------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | 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?



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, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

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



#1865



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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> |



#1865



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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?



#1865



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?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | I don't know |
| 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. | I don't know |
| 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. | I don't know |
| 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. | I don't know |



#1865



Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

I don't know

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | |
| Water | |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | |
| 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?

I would prefer to use private contractors for the collection of household refuse, they offer options that are far better than the council, to remove those contractors such as the yellow bags penalises those of use who have made a real effort to reduce



#1871



household rubbish, older people, and those on steep driveways where using wheelie bins are dangerous and difficult to use,

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The North Shore has to pay for all the services like the transit system, yet reap none of the benefit. We are not getting a cycleway on the Auckland Harbour Bridge or anything to reduce congestion and delays.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Getting the scheduled buses to run, especially those used by school children. It's dangerous to leave children at the bus stops as buses are cancelled, and the ones that do stop are too full to take many more passengers, children are balking off school, or refusing to go. Commuters are now using their private vehicles because the buses are so unreliable.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The Waterfront Concert venue/stadium. It's the most ill thought out plan, a pure vanity project and Auckland ratepayers can not afford it.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The Stadium has been completely mismanaged since it fell under the auspices of Auckland Council. It hosted major sporting events, plus local events, attracted world class and NZ concerts. The council's mismanagement has ruined it by removing half of the stadium's seating for a baseball franchise that everyone knew was teetering on the edge, then acting as if you were surprised when it went belly up is an example how the council failed to do a thorough due diligence, The stadium should be extended, not



#1871



removed. It's perfectly located for concerts as it has the Albany bus station, although only about 1 in 3 scheduled buses actually runs. It is also well positioned ed box the motorways for access fri western, northern and southern suburbs, .It needs to have the sports facilities to be returned to how it was it was before the baseball franchise fiasco. Despite the council intentionally let it run down, it is the only decent sports facility on n the north shore and also serves West Auckland and North Auckland. It's terribly unfair fair for all the people who could use it if it wasn't so mismanaged,.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Selling it is a short term solution but a long term loss. By selling it, you are robbing the Auckland of income stretching decades ahead. We have to think about the next generations of Aucklanders.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

The council is mismanaging it. Also forget a stadium/concert venue on the waterfront. It's a vanity project for the council. Access will always be an issue, as congestion is terrible in that area. Only people from a small slice of Auckland has access to the train network. The Britonart bus terminus has gone, and the bus serie is so poor you can't rely in it. There will be fewer public parking spaces ll n the vicinity. Building it will cause more problems than it solves. Put money into the currently poorly run North Harbour stadium if you have money to burn in the waterfront project, and outsource the management to a company with experience and a team capable of. running , promoting and building the business, back to or acceding where it was before the council took it over.



#1871



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

The council always spends more than the projected cost, and when it eventually is finished it becomes a white elephant. I also don't think the council should manage any more than they currently have as they are unable do what they have efficiently or on

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#1871



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | |
| 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. | 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. | |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | I don't know |



#1871



| |
|--|
| 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year. |
|--|

6b. Do you have 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 will be very unhappy, as will many local residents in the household rubbish collection to be incorporated into the rates. It penalises the elderly, people living alone and those who have made a concerted effort to reduce waste. We currently ink out a yellow bag of household rubbish once a month. We compost our food and green waste and we buy products with minimal packaging so only out the recycling bin every 4-6 weeks. It's totally unfair to incorporate into the rates. It should be based on usage, not a money grab from the council. We also find in windy times, the food waste, rubbish and recycling bins end up all over the road. The bags were perfect, they stayed out until collected and then nothing left on the kerb afterwards.

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| |
|---|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. |
|---|

Fairly Important



#1871



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

The Hibisxus and Bays do an amazing job, particularly Julia Parfitt. She is a conduit to the council when the council has failed to reply and gets results, or at least an answer. I live in an area where we get a lot of visitors, and she has made sure that

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I overall it is reasonable..Some don't impact me directly, but I feel,they are generally working for the greater good of the. Community, especially when we see the muppets at North harbour board with vanity members, some of,whom don't even live in he area, but love the supposed kudos of being a board member so they can swagger around . Hibiscus and Bays is a pleasant change from North Harbour.



#1871



8. Do you have any other comments?

There should be a discount record lone pensioners living in properties. They have often been widowed, and ads on fixed income who have to pay more while they use less of many services I, d



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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?



#1873



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The community will support the stadium if it is run more efficiently. The North Shore NEEDS the stadium for tot bringing people to partake, directly or indirectly for encouraging people to improve their health and wellbeing. With genuinely committed management after the fields has been brought up to scratch can fully utilizes these 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)?

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:



#1873



4d. Do you have 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> | |



#1873



| | |
|---|--|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Public transport - minimise cost of travel so people can use it more.

Cycleways.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1878



Less free events (music in parks, movies, festivals, etc.)

Less gardening - less flowers in pavement borders, you need to plant bushes and plants that are low maintenance.

Less changes in urban environment - no need to change shape and form of public spaces so frequently, leave as is.

Less grants - do not spend our money to fund initiatives of individuals or arts, the only justified spend is for the youth, the sick, the homeless and the elderly.

Less speed bumps and traffic lights.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Stop the raised pedestrian crossings, this is a waste of money and have been put in areas where there has never been a problem.

More cycleways so that people use cars less and children are safe.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycleways.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised pedestrian crossings.

Traffic lights.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

This is the only stadium in the North Shore of a reasonable size to host events.



#1878



It is beautiful, easily accessible via the Albany bus station and a great asset for the community.

The North Shore people need the Council to promote and organise more athletic and musical events in the North Shore, as the population has increased and would like to have access to a variety of organised events without having to travel 30-50km.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

The council should belong and serve the people of Auckland, and should not operate as a business. This would have the risk of people need to pay for services in the future which they have already funded via the rates. We need the Auckland council to be a non-profit organisation which looks after its people, not a private business with the intention to make profit.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Retain underlying council ownership, lease the operation and use the upfront payment for important initiatives that will improve public transport.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#1878



There is need to invest in better public transport and cycleways, as the city and the population grows.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:

I don't agree with moving the port of Auckland, this contributes to the local economy and would have an impact if it moved away from the city.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | 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 | Support |



#1878



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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 |



#1878



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Not Important |



#1878



| | |
|---|------------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The budget needs to focus on better public transport and cycleways.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

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:



#1879



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 |



#1879



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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> | 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> | Support |
| <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> | 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 |



#1879



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



#1879



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.

Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Very Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#1882



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#1882



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 we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in | Support |



#1882



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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 |



#1882



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



#1882



| | |
|---|------------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Ōrākei Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Ōrākei in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Complete the seismic strengthening of the Remuera Library | Fairly Important |
| Progress the Meadowbank Community Centre development. | Fairly Important |
| Assess the reactivation of facilities at Tagalad Reserve and work towards providing access for the community. | Very Important |
| Continue to work with our many community volunteers to eradicate plant and animal pests in our natural environment, including at Pourewa Valley and in our many beautiful parks and urban forests, and support other environmental activities, for example, the Environmental Forum. | Not Important |



#1882



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Continue local initiatives to enhance neighbourhood connections and increase safety. | Fairly Important |
| Fund and support local events to showcase our spaces and benefit local residents and businesses. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to engage and better support our diverse communities and organisations, such as Auckland East Community Network and Youth of Ōrākei. | Fairly Important |
| Maintain efforts to monitor and improve water quality in our local waterways. | Very Important |
| Develop options and projects for a community facilities targeted rate for the financial year 2025/2026. | Very Important |
| Investigate ways to enhance council facilities in Ellerslie to better meet the needs of the local community. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Ōrākei 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More cycleways and public transport options

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



fewer roads

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

More cycleways are better for cities, and raised pedestrian crossings are better for public safety

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport and cycleways

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Anything involving improving passenger vehicle flows. Incentives public transport and cycleways

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

It is underutilized, but the facilities are good. simply host more events there

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:



#1890



the problem with conservatism is eventually you run out of state assets to sell off.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:

If you put it in a fund, some MBA hack will simply sell it off, leaving future generations poorer for short term gain.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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



#1890



Tell us why:

It's prime waterfront space that could be utilized like wynyard quarter.

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>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura 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> |



#1890



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#1890



| | |
|---|----------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | I don't know |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Proposal does not make financial sense as it is deficient in its analysis and is strategically flawed.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#1975



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Why take on the risk and cost of a small fund which will not make a substantive difference to Auckland

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

We need a clear long term (>30 years) strategy to be developed to support any proposed change - as a minimum this needs to include how we will move goods in and out of the port, economic impact to Auckland if POA changes, how goods will be moved into Au

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

As above - we need a long term strategy to guide development rather than a piecemeal approach

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#1975



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | Support |
| <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> | Do not 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> | Do not 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> | |



#1975



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#1975



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Not that inspirational

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Restore North Harbour stadium to be a key asset for sporting and cultural events. It's access to the transport network of the city is second to none. Some of the best stadiums in the world are not in downtown areas. Wembley and Yankees stadiums spring to mind.



#1976



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Trams and or light rail.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Motorways in the city

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

This is the best football venue in NZ. We should actually be looking to spend more on further developments. Why waste money on a stadium downtown when we already have NH stadium? That is an idea promoted by people who live south of the bridge and don't realise that 500k people call the NS home. We are ratepayers and taxpayers as well.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#1976



Auckland airport ownership without a local community voice would weaken community say in airport development.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#1976



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. | 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 | |



#1976



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

All refuse disposal should be based on pay as you throw. This would reduce waste to landfill.

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#1976



| | |
|---|------------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Light rail or elevated rail on the north shore.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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?

Reduce the transport /roading teams powers. A second harbour crossing.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Get rid of the cones, any more speed bumps, 30KPH areas and unused cycle ways.



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland has been mismanaged for many years by unelected, faceless bureaucrats. They have made getting around Auckland an unpleasant, lengthy and disruptive experience. Auckland has become the city of cones, restricted speed limits and speed bumps.. a nightmare.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Flood safety. Parks. amenities.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

RMP, Bureaucracy, Speedbumps, cycleways, speed limit reduction.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Not enough detail re change the operational management plan.

I would hate the stadium to become more apartments. The current playing fields and car parking must remain

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



#1988



Tell us why:

Off set less rates increase

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Auckland port should be moved outside of Auckland, and a stadium built

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:

Spread the risk 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?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#1988



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

A all purpose Stadium springs to mind, Big enough for test match cricket, Soccer, Rugby union etc.

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>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> |



#1988



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

In the current economic environment, people are struggling big time. I sometimes think councils are blind to what is going on with the people. Rate hikes proposed at this time, are going to send a lot of people to the wall.

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?



#1988



I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Less road works and less cycleways.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#1988



Need more information.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | 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?

Do not remove rubbish bins in towns

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No More maori language



signs

no special fund

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Minimise rail

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Can't trust council plans

Keep as is.



#2008



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:



#2008



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>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>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura 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> | |



#2008



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#2008



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | 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?

I would be prepared to pay more if the spending was more equitable - I am annoyed at having to pay for the stupid rail link while North Shore gets no transport benefits at all. And the CBD needs sorting out. It has been a building site forever, and it's embarrassing when we have visitors.



#2024



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less consultation, meetings, arguments over pointless stuff. More delivery. Don't bother with paying for major events until you've sorted out the day-to-day living issues.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Do not make people pay for park and ride. It defeats the entire point. Here on North Shore, we have no benefit from the CRL, yet we've paid billions for it. Don't make us pay for parking too. Instead, improve the existing facilities, build multi-storey parking, and continue to encourage use of public transport and reduced car usage.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Reinstate a direct bus route from North Shore to the airport. Currently, there is little option except to drive.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

CRL.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management, Other

Tell us why:

Rebuild the half of the stadium that was removed in a previous ill-thought-out decision. Make it a real stadium again. Then get management that actually has an interest in hosting events there. Why on earth is anyone thinking of building a new stadium on the waterfront (not needed) when we already have facilities that are underutilized? This could be a fabulous small/mid-sized stadium that can be used for many types of events (sport, music, etc) and actually benefit an area that has no current venue. Don't



#2024



waste yet more billions on a waterfront dinosaur that is not needed - use what we have and provide a revitalized hub for North Shore.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

You obviously want to see the shares. This way, there appears to be more transparency about where the money ends up, rather than just disappearing into a general council coffer. A future fund also makes sense, since all we seem to hear at the moment is that we're still paying for old decisions. Let's try to get ahead for once and have money available when it is needed, rather than have to increase rates 5 years after the fact.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

In principle I support the option to lease the operation. But I worry that this will result in reduced flexibility if circumstances change.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

We need to think long-term.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?



#2024



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

The CBD is a disaster at present. The waterfront of Auckland is the greatest asset and should be used accordingly. Go look at some other waterfront cities to see what Auckland could/should look like.

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:

Again, we need to use the waterfront for recreation, dining, and to make Auckland a fabulous destination. Right now it is a concrete mess.

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> |



#2024



| | |
|---|----------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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. | 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?



#2024



Water quality improvements are urgently needed. I support higher rates to achieve this.

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Not Important |



#2024



| | |
|---|------------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

We need to focus on maintaining what we have and ensuring it is fit for purpose in the future. Only then should we start on new things.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

My priority is Glenvar Road, Glenvar Road, Glenvar Road. It's a major accident waiting to happen and I generally avoid it where possible. Stop building stupid raised crossings and get it done already. Also the ferry route is important - if housing continues to be built, the people who move in need a range of transport options. The Gulf Harbour ferry should be reassessed only when the Penlink is completed.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Despite a lot of bluster by the mayor, I don't see a lot of movement on 'controlling' CCOs or cutting waste. As I recall, that was central to the election promises, and yet we still see daily stupidity by the likes of AT, Eke Panuku, and Watercare. And if we are to pay higher rates, then I want to see the benefits locally. My rates went up by 20% between 2022 and 2023 and a further 10% between 2023 and 2024. And so far, I have seen only cuts, not services.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | 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?



#2076



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

As a North Harbour resident I enjoy using the stadium and go as often as I can to Been to the majority of stadium live sporting events (ABs, North Harbour Rugby NPC/FPC and school rugby regional finals etc, Blues, Phoenix) over the decades. Was a disaster watching the stands being demolished for some hair brained baseball franchise that was already struggling. Poor management has led us to where we are at. If North Auckland is a fast growing part of Auckland. Removing the Stadium makes no sense and if it happens unlikely to get a replacement to hold any future events meaning one of the fastest growing region would need to commute to other Stadiums. All Auckland stadiums suffer from the same problems, transport, parking and maintenance. A change in operational management with a financial incentive in ensuring the Stadium is successful like previous management and a local flavour would be best.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#2076



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#2076



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>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> |



#2076



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#2076



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

We really need to clean up the waterways and run offs. Every year the rainfall increases and every year the beaches are closed more often with contamination. It's getting to be a embarrassing for our International standing.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

We are living in difficult times. Many of us can't afford any more rate increases. The council needs to restructure and half less management roles. This will significantly cut payroll costs..



#2077



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Tens of thousands of rate payers don't use public transport. Those who use it should be meeting any increases. I do agree with stopping cycle ways developments. Only do what must be done.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Where is the cost analysis. If the stadium is draining money without any real benefit then sell it.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

You should have kept this question about the airport rather throwing the Ports into the argument. .



#2077



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

It is difficult to give a definitive response without all information. If the council is benefitting from a profitable business it would seem yo make sense to continue for now as leasing the land is always an option of things change. However, I would like to see what plans are ion place to maximise profits from the operation. A full restructure might be necessary to significantly reduce operating costs.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Invest some and use some for operating costs, however, it should be used for essential services only and not for pet projects that are not core to council business.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

I would again restate the need to restructure the entire council framework. As rate payers we see an almighty ivory tower with people earning more than they would in the private sector (according to reports I have read). The payroll needs to be slashed as it will be one of the biggest costs. We want essential services not pet projects that we see consuming money everywhere.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#2077



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> | 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> | 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 |



#2077



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Another transport mode over the harbor from the CBD to the North Shore

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It's not fit for purpose any more. Any belief that a different organization could do better is misguided. And I wouldn't support Council funding for that 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?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#2078



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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



#2078



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted 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. | 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 | Support |



#2078



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#2078



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Build more/improve in more boat ramps with 7ù

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2086



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

It would help get Auckland mov

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle Lanesboro

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Sick of seeing council land being sold to developers for next to nothing and this is land that the ratepayers bought years ago

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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



#2086



Tell us here:

The council will only waste any big payout on stuff we don't need and in 5 years time we will be in more debt than ever and one less asset

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

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

Do not support



#2086

| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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). | 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. | 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 |



#2086



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Allocate more funding to local community parks. All new subdivisions should be REQUIRED to include not only a "reserve" (ie bare land block) but should be required to held to account to build basic park facilities (such as paths, BBQ area, gardens, landscaping etc)for community use

Also, express lane for buses from Orewa to Albany



#2091



Train services from North Shore into CBD

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less spending on dedicated pedestrian and cycleways in demographic areas where they won't be used much

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

From Orewa/Silverdale into CBD there is a massive need for better public transport. There are no dedicated bus lanes from Orewa to Albany, no trains. Massive new subdivisions north of Silverdale makes traffic backlogged in cars, or on buses

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Dedicated bus lane on Northern Motorway

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



#2091



Tell us 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:

4d. Do you have 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:



#2091



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>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>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>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> |



#2091



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#2091



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Should be some allocation of funding for local reserves who have already been waiting over 3 years for park facilities in established subdivisions (East Coast Heights subdivision currently has a bare block of land on Pohewa Rd and after 3 years is still waiting for funding allocation)

8. Do you have any other comments?

Please allocate funding to our local reserve on Pohewa Road, Silverdale. Many residents have lived in the East Coast Heights subdivision for close to 3 years and we have NO park facilities for families or children to use. This is a bare lot and no sign of any funding for facilities such as paths, playground, trees, gardens, sports areas, dog areas etc





Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

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)?

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



#2111



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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> |



#2111



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | I don't know |
| 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?



#2111



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Upper Harbour

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Strengthen partnerships with local mana whenua through project delivery, including Te Kete Rukuruku, completion of David Lange Park playground and improvements. | |
| Deliver community climate initiatives such as Low Carbon Lifestyles, and Māngere Bike Hub with our community partners. | |
| Deliver a community-driven safety action plan aimed at tackling anti-social behaviour and addressing local safety concerns enhancing the overall sense of safety within our local community. | |
| Improve employment and economic opportunities through our local economic broker programme. | |
| Support community-led activations at our parks and facilities through our community grants. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#2111



Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants. | |
| Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme. | |
| Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models. | |
| Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum. | |
| Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative). | |



#2111



| | |
|--|--|
| Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion. | |
|--|--|

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?

Tell us why

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | |



#2111



| | |
|--|--|
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?



#2111



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#2140



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?

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 for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#2140



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?



#2140



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Albert-Eden, Aotea/Great Barrier, Devonport-Takapuna, Franklin, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Howick, Kaipātiki, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōrākei, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Papakura, Puketāpapa, Rodney, Upper Harbour, Waiheke, Waitākere Ranges, Waitemāt

Albert-Eden Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Albert-Eden in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Celebrating different people and cultures, bringing people together with fun and engaging activities, and reducing barriers for those who might struggle to connect with council or others in the community. | |
| Continuing our environmental work through tree planting, parks restoration, supporting volunteer pest control and planting groups and helping community climate action through our Climate Activator. | |
| Planning for how our parks and open space can respond to growth, making the most of what we have, balancing different uses and connecting green spaces together. | |
| Supporting our community groups with funding, information, learning new skills and building their capability and networks. | |
| Settling in at the new, medium-term location for the Pt Chevalier library and continuing to | |



#2140



| | |
|---|--|
| investigate what the long-term library solution might be and how we will fund it. | |
| Working with the community on activations in the Mt Albert Civic Square. | |
| Making our parks rubbish-bin free to minimise waste and improve environmental and climate outcomes. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Albert-Eden proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Aotea/Great Barrier in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Continue the regular programme of funding for community groups to deliver services and environmental groups to deliver ecology works. | |
| Continue our regular maintenance of parks and assets. | |
| Investigate improvements for playground areas island-wide. | |
| Support implementation of aspects of the new Destination Management Plan. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Aotea/Great Barrier proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#2140



Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna. | |
| Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces. | |
| Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan. | |
| Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu. | |
| Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike. | |
| Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park. | |
| Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances. | |

Tell us why



#2140



7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, 'Belmont' Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.</p> | |
| <p>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 Papatuuaanuku (environmental restoration).</p> | |
| <p>Develop "Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines" to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.</p> | |
| <p>Find ways to reduce Franklin's maintenance costs e.g. by replacing lawn with eco-</p> | |



#2140



| | |
|--|--|
| 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

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

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 | |



#2140



| | |
|--|--|
| health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey. | |
| Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities. | |
| Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | |



#2140



| | |
|---|--|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Howick Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan. | |
| Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan. | |



#2140



| | |
|---|--|
| Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support. | |
| Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses. | |
| Develop a community-led climate action plan. | |
| Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Kaipātiki in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#2140



| | |
|--|--|
| Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs. | |
| Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community | |
| Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control. | |
| Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation. | |
| Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan. | |
| Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#2140



Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Strengthen partnerships with local mana whenua through project delivery, including Te Kete Rukuruku, completion of David Lange Park playground and improvements. | |
| Deliver community climate initiatives such as Low Carbon Lifestyles, and Māngere Bike Hub with our community partners. | |
| Deliver a community-driven safety action plan aimed at tackling anti-social behaviour and addressing local safety concerns enhancing the overall sense of safety within our local community. | |
| Improve employment and economic opportunities through our local economic broker programme. | |
| Support community-led activations at our parks and facilities through our community grants. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Manurewa Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Manurewa in 2024/2025?



#2140



I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Continue to support, deliver and fund initiatives that contribute to positive youth development. | |
| Invest in evidence-based projects that focus on crime prevention, safer communities and injury prevention. | |
| Fund and support activities that include older people and foster their community participation with a specific focus on reaching older migrants. | |
| Invest in community led projects and initiatives that respond to social connection and cohesion, build climate resilience and contribute to climate action. | |
| Develop a masterplan for Mountfort Park to ensure our open space and sports field network meets the demands of our diverse communities. | |
| Identify options for recreational activities to support people of all ages and abilities being casually active. | |
| Investigate community lease options to support Ngāti Tamaoho aspirations for a cultural hub at Te Pua/Keith Park. | |
| Investigate the feasibility of an arts broker programme to nurture creative expression with a focus on supporting Māori and Pacific creative arts. | |

Tell us why



#2140



7c. What do you think of the Manurewa proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants. | |
| Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme. | |
| Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models. | |
| Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum. | |
| Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative). | |



#2140



| | |
|--|--|
| Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion. | |
|--|--|

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?

Tell us why

Ōrākei Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Ōrākei in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Complete the seismic strengthening of the Remuera Library | |
| Progress the Meadowbank Community Centre development. | |



#2140



| | |
|--|--|
| Assess the reactivation of facilities at Tagalad Reserve and work towards providing access for the community. | |
| Continue to work with our many community volunteers to eradicate plant and animal pests in our natural environment, including at Pourewa Valley and in our many beautiful parks and urban forests, and support other environmental activities, for example, the Environmental Forum. | |
| Continue local initiatives to enhance neighbourhood connections and increase safety. | |
| Fund and support local events to showcase our spaces and benefit local residents and businesses. | |
| Continue to engage and better support our diverse communities and organisations, such as Auckland East Community Network and Youth of Ōrākei. | |
| Maintain efforts to monitor and improve water quality in our local waterways. | |
| Develop options and projects for a community facilities targeted rate for the financial year 2025/2026. | |
| Investigate ways to enhance council facilities in Ellerslie to better meet the needs of the local community. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Ōrākei proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#2140



Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Ōtara-Papatoetoe in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Through grants, support community-led events and initiatives that create safe neighbourhoods and promoting active living, sustainable practices.</p> | |
| <p>Support activities to increase social cohesion, neighbourly connections, better outreach to people from smaller ethnic groups and connect newer settlers to local services.</p> | |
| <p>Increase youth empowerment through supporting leadership and training programmes as well as prioritising youth engagement.</p> | |
| <p>Identify and promote 'Play advocacy' for local opportunities in projects that can provide spaces for play in places beyond playgrounds.</p> | |
| <p>Continue to support and look to increase environmental and sustainability projects to address climate change and environmental challenges through community-led projects and by working with mana whenua.</p> | |



#2140



| | |
|---|--|
| | |
| Explore options for ways of delivering increased local economic outcomes for small to large businesses. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Papakura Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Papakura in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura. | |
| We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves. | |
| We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area. | |



#2140



| | |
|--|--|
| We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment. | |
| Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Papakura proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Puketāpapa Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Puketāpapa in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Invest in opportunities to support local community leadership. | |
| Invest in climate change response initiatives and support volunteer groups working on local environmental restoration / protection and climate action programmes. | |
| Consider our investment in facilities and services to see if there are opportunities to do better. | |
| Support initiatives that improve and encourage walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Help coordinate and support local business groups. | |

Tell us why



#2140



7c. What do you think of the Puketāpapa proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | |



#2140



| | |
|---|--|
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere | |



#2140



| | |
|---|--|
| Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#2140



| | |
|---|--|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island’s natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitākere Ranges in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#2140



| | |
|--|--|
| Initiatives to support community resilience and safety. | |
| Progress priority actions from the Waitākere Ranges Local Climate Plan (currently under development). | |
| 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. | |
| 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?

Waitematā Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitematā in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#2140



| | |
|--|--|
| Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road. | |
| Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works. | |
| Phased delivery of improvements for Heard Park. | |
| Deliver services and programmes that support youth activation, leadership, and wellbeing, particularly in Newmarket. | |
| Develop programmes that improve perceptions of safety within the City Centre, and our town-centres. | |
| Support local communities to develop Emergency Planning & Readiness Response Plans. | |
| Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waitematā proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#2140



Whau Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Whau in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>We will work with our partners to build community capacity, from climate/emergency preparedness and community resilience to increased participation and community capability.</p> | |
| <p>We will encourage and support volunteerism and community participation, especially through environmental and ecological initiatives around the Manukau Harbour and foreshore, the Whau River and its tributaries, and our urban ngahere.</p> | |
| <p>We will continue to undertake governance-level engagement and collaboration with mana whenua and the other west Auckland local boards.</p> | |
| <p>We will work with the local BIDs where possible, to support local economy and to realise shared goals around climate action, community connection and belonging.</p> | |
| <p>We will consider accessibility and inclusion across our services, engagement, and other initiatives.</p> | |

Tell us why



#2140



7c. What do you think of the Whau 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#2182



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> |



#2182



| | |
|---|----------------|
| harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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. | Support |



#2182



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Fairly Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Very Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Very Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Very Important |



#2182



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Very Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Fairly Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Not from the Rodney area

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#2223



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

Captain Cook Wharf and Marsden Wharf will be developed to boost people flow and economy

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 |



#2223



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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 |



#2223



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna. | |
| Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces. | |
| Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan. | |
| Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu. | |
| Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike. | |



#2223



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.

Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.

Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.

Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones,



#2223



| | |
|---|--|
| including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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?



#2230



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#2230



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>Do not support</p> |
|---|-----------------------|



#2230



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> |
| <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> |



#2230



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Rodney

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna. | |
| Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces. | |
| Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan. | |
| Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu. | |
| Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses | |



#2230



| | |
|--|--|
| and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike. | |
| Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park. | |
| Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on | |



#2230



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>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> | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.</p> | |
| <p>Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.</p> | |



#2230



| | |
|--|--|
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | As proposed |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

The road construction in the city center has not been completed after several years, so there is no need to repair it anymore.



#2238



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?

Increase education and medical care

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Road maintenance

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



#2238



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#2238



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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 |



#2238



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

everything



#2242



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

there has been no improvement at all for the past few years with AT's work and the things are getting worse. I think instead of investing more, better to re-look at how to make AI work better, more efficient, and waste less tax.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

AT company.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

spend less money is the key

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?



#2242



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#2242



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | Do not support |



#2242



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



#2242



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

I wonder what time and cost has been invested in this campaign, which appears to be a manipulative attempt to get people to be happy with enormous rates increases - or



#2248



relieved about less enormous but still unacceptably large rates increases. I would suggest that campaigns such as this should certainly be “done less.”.

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:



#2248



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted 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 |



#2248



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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 |



#2248



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



#2248



| | |
|---|------------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#2253



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <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> |



#2253



| | |
|---|--------------|
| for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 . | 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?



#2253



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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and | Not Important |



#2253



| | |
|---|---------------|
| other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Support Sport organisations and improve facilities, 100s of thousands of children, teenagers and adults (all genders) living healthy active lives with aspirations and building relationships. reduce issues with crime , mental health, medical health etc and save the public a lot of money.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Reduce rates!

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Doing nothing will help aucklanders live .



#2262



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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:



#2262



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <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> |
|---|-----------------------|



#2262



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>Do not 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>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> |



#2262



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | |



#2262



| | |
|---|--|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Reduce government cost. Reduce council rate and water cost!



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

reduce council salary



#2265



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

we don't have money

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

reduce spend

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#2265



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

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



#2265



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> | <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>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura 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> | |



#2265



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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?

we don't have money



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#2266



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Countless funds have already been spent on not much. It would be much better to spend less on not much

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#2266



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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.

Do not support



#2266



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted 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 . | 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 | Support |



#2266



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#2266



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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?



#2273

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Rapid transit systems are always a scam. Don't put money into them, they're never economic. On any level.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Trains.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell it all. Use the proceeds to pay off debt, and reduce rates increases.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Council's job is shared roads and pipes. Airports are best handled by private operators.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other



#2273



Tell us here:

Sell it all. Ports are best handled by private operators.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Anything to reduce rates. People are hurting BAD out there.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell it all.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

Sell it all.

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



#2273



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | Do not 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> | 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> | 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> | 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 |



#2273



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

The rates funded refuse collection proposal is grossly unfair for those who don't create much refuse.

The gross polluters will be subsidised by those of us who aren't.

It will increase the amount of refuse created, because there will be no incentive to create less.

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?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.

Not Important



#2273



| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

All non-core activities that a roads-n-pipes council shouldn't be spending money on.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Overblown, excessive nonsense.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

BUILD MORE ROAD

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

LESS STAFF INEFFICIENCY



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?

STOP SPENDING MONEY ON THOSE STUPID PROJECTS LIKE THE PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLING NORTH SHORE BRIDGE.

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:



#2278



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 |



#2278



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |



#2278



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Do your job first and stop raising more money from us

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Do your job first and stop raising more money from us



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Council has been wasting money and not providing efficient service

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#2284



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 | I don't know |



#2284



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | Do not support |
| <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 |



#2284



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I don't agree with all council's proposals

Do your job properly first before jumping to next projects

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Albert-Eden, Aotea/Great Barrier, Devonport-Takapuna, Franklin, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Howick, Kaipātiki, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōrākei, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Papakura, Puketāpapa, Rodney, Upper Harbour, Waiheke, Waitākere Ranges, Waitemāt

Albert-Eden Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Albert-Eden in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Celebrating different people and cultures, bringing people together with fun and engaging activities, and reducing barriers for those who might struggle to connect with council or others in the community. | |
| Continuing our environmental work through tree planting, parks restoration, supporting volunteer pest control and planting groups and helping community climate action through our Climate Activator. | |
| Planning for how our parks and open space can respond to growth, making the most of what we have, balancing different uses and connecting green spaces together. | |



#2284



| | |
|---|--|
| Supporting our community groups with funding, information, learning new skills and building their capability and networks. | |
| Settling in at the new, medium-term location for the Pt Chevalier library and continuing to investigate what the long-term library solution might be and how we will fund it. | |
| Working with the community on activations in the Mt Albert Civic Square. | |
| Making our parks rubbish-bin free to minimise waste and improve environmental and climate outcomes. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Albert-Eden proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Aotea/Great Barrier in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Continue the regular programme of funding for community groups to deliver services and environmental groups to deliver ecology works. | |
| Continue our regular maintenance of parks and assets. | |
| Investigate improvements for playground areas island-wide. | |
| Support implementation of aspects of the new Destination Management Plan. | |



#2284



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Aotea/Great Barrier proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna. | |
| Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces. | |
| Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan. | |
| Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu. | |
| Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike. | |
| Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles | |



#2284



| | |
|--|--|
| Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park. | |
| Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Franklin Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, 'Belmont' Sports Park development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme. | |
| 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 | |



#2284



| | |
|---|--|
| 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

Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities



#2284



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. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#2284



| | |
|---|--|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Howick Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities



#2284



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan. | |
| Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan. | |
| Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support. | |
| Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses. | |
| Develop a community-led climate action plan. | |
| Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#2284



Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Kaipātiki in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs. | |
| Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community | |
| Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control. | |
| Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation. | |
| Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan. | |



#2284



Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Māngere-Ōtāhuhu in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Strengthen partnerships with local mana whenua through project delivery, including Te Kete Rukuruku, completion of David Lange Park playground and improvements. | |
| Deliver community climate initiatives such as Low Carbon Lifestyles, and Māngere Bike Hub with our community partners. | |
| Deliver a community-driven safety action plan aimed at tackling anti-social behaviour and addressing local safety concerns enhancing the overall sense of safety within our local community. | |
| Improve employment and economic opportunities through our local economic broker programme. | |
| Support community-led activations at our parks and facilities through our community grants. | |

Tell us why



#2284



7c. What do you think of the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Manurewa Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Manurewa in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Continue to support, deliver and fund initiatives that contribute to positive youth development. | |
| Invest in evidence-based projects that focus on crime prevention, safer communities and injury prevention. | |
| Fund and support activities that include older people and foster their community participation with a specific focus on reaching older migrants. | |
| Invest in community led projects and initiatives that respond to social connection and cohesion, build climate resilience and contribute to climate action. | |
| Develop a masterplan for Mountfort Park to ensure our open space and sports field network meets the demands of our diverse communities. | |
| Identify options for recreational activities to support people of all ages and abilities being casually active. | |



#2284



| | |
|--|--|
| Investigate community lease options to support Ngāti Tamaoho aspirations for a cultural hub at Te Pua/Keith Park. | |
| Investigate the feasibility of an arts broker programme to nurture creative expression with a focus on supporting Māori and Pacific creative arts. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Manurewa proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants. | |
| Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme. | |
| Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models. | |
| Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki | |



#2284



| | |
|---|--|
| Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum. | |
| Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative). | |
| Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?

Tell us why

Ōrākei Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Ōrākei in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities



#2284



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Complete the seismic strengthening of the Remuera Library | |
| Progress the Meadowbank Community Centre development. | |
| Assess the reactivation of facilities at Tagalad Reserve and work towards providing access for the community. | |
| Continue to work with our many community volunteers to eradicate plant and animal pests in our natural environment, including at Pourewa Valley and in our many beautiful parks and urban forests, and support other environmental activities, for example, the Environmental Forum. | |
| Continue local initiatives to enhance neighbourhood connections and increase safety. | |
| Fund and support local events to showcase our spaces and benefit local residents and businesses. | |
| Continue to engage and better support our diverse communities and organisations, such as Auckland East Community Network and Youth of Ōrākei. | |
| Maintain efforts to monitor and improve water quality in our local waterways. | |
| Develop options and projects for a community facilities targeted rate for the financial year 2025/2026. | |
| Investigate ways to enhance council facilities in Ellerslie to better meet the needs of the local community. | |



#2284



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Ōrākei proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Ōtara-Papatoetoe in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Through grants, support community-led events and initiatives that create safe neighbourhoods and promoting active living, sustainable practices. | |
| Support activities to increase social cohesion, neighbourly connections, better outreach to people from smaller ethnic groups and connect newer settlers to local services. | |
| Increase youth empowerment through supporting leadership and training programmes as well as prioritising youth engagement. | |
| Identify and promote 'Play advocacy' for local opportunities in projects that can provide spaces for play in places beyond playgrounds. | |



#2284



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Continue to support and look to increase environmental and sustainability projects to address climate change and environmental challenges through community-led projects and by working with mana whenua.</p> | |
| <p>Explore options for ways of delivering increased local economic outcomes for small to large businesses.</p> | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Papakura Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Papakura in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.</p> | |
| <p>We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual</p> | |



#2284



| | |
|---|--|
| naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves. | |
| We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area. | |
| We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment. | |
| Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Papakura proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Puketāpapa Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Puketāpapa in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Invest in opportunities to support local community leadership. | |
| Invest in climate change response initiatives and support volunteer groups working on local environmental restoration / protection and climate action programmes. | |
| Consider our investment in facilities and services to see if there are opportunities to do better. | |



#2284



| | |
|---|--|
| Support initiatives that improve and encourage walking and cycling opportunities. | |
| Help coordinate and support local business groups. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Puketāpapa proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | |



#2284



| | |
|---|--|
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | |



#2284



| | |
|--|--|
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?



#2284



Waiheke Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waiheke in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Delivering core council operational services, such as mowing, track and facility maintenance, and the library. | |
| Programmes which protect, restore, and enhance the island's natural environment, and initiatives that provide opportunities for community connectedness, capability and resilience. | |
| Working with our community and businesses to progress actions within the Waiheke Island Climate Action Plan. | |
| Progressing recommended actions within the Waiheke Local Parks Management Plan and the Rangihoua Reserve and Onetangi Sports Park Reserve Management Plan. | |
| Working with mana whenua and mataawaka to identify and respond to their needs and aspirations. | |
| Capital projects including the Tawaipareira Reserve playground. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waiheke proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#2284



Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitākere Ranges in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Initiatives to support community resilience and safety. | |
| Progress priority actions from the Waitākere Ranges Local Climate Plan (currently under development). | |
| 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. | |
| 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?



#2284



Waitematā Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitematā in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road. | |
| Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works. | |
| Phased delivery of improvements for Heard Park. | |
| Deliver services and programmes that support youth activation, leadership, and wellbeing, particularly in Newmarket. | |
| Develop programmes that improve perceptions of safety within the City Centre, and our town-centres. | |
| Support local communities to develop Emergency Planning & Readiness Response Plans. | |
| Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible. | |



#2284



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waitemata proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Whau Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Whau in 2024/2025?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>We will work with our partners to build community capacity, from climate/emergency preparedness and community resilience to increased participation and community capability.</p> | |
| <p>We will encourage and support volunteerism and community participation, especially through environmental and ecological initiatives around the Manukau Harbour and foreshore, the Whau River and its tributaries, and our urban ngahere.</p> | |
| <p>We will continue to undertake governance-level engagement and collaboration with mana whenua and the other west Auckland local boards.</p> | |
| <p>We will work with the local BIDs where possible, to support local economy and to realise shared goals around climate action, community connection and belonging.</p> | |



#2284



We will consider accessibility and inclusion across our services, engagement, and other initiatives.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Whau proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Stop wasting tax payers money and please do your job and function properly



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | As 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 our current Leisure Centres and spaces are not of a standard expected, and therefore, underutilised. Prime examples are: Activzone Glenfield. Glenfield Leisure Centre. Stanmore Bay Leisure Centre. All regularly closed due to requiring maintenance works. They are old properties, and don't offer something for everyone across all generations. They are too small, too limited and the staff in each don't seem



#2322



to have foresight / or be given direction to make the venues "fun" and "inspiring" or places to "connect" with others.

Rubbish bins in all public places is a real issue. Why are we not separating recycling - yet we do this at home? Why are the bins being taken away... why are there not dedicated doggy poo bins like in other cities/destinations around NZ?

I'd like to see the motorway edges/berms planted with a low maintenance grass/flax that doesn't require mowing/weed eating and looks good year round. Same for roundabouts that now looks super scruffy as they haven't been planted out/re-planted in many areas (in the long run, this should provide massive cost savings!!)

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Purchasing of vehicles for Council use.

Can Council staff all access their workplaces via public transport? This should be a MUST! Some might, but I believe many don't use the public transport. If they did, then there'd be more problems solved I truly believe. How can you expect people to catch the bus when there's no bus shelters. Just look at Whangaparaoa Road as a prime example... very few actual shelters... and it rains in Auckland - A LOT!! No bus-lane down the motorway from the Hibiscus Coast (or North) until Albany - peak hour to the city used to take 45 minutes on the bus, now is regularly 2hrs 15mins and three buses later! It's ridiculous!! Plus, with Penlink eventually being completed, that will flow (if it flows at all) on to an already congested 2-lane motorway. Stop allowing houses to be built/roads to be built where there is already congestion and not enough infrastructure - ie. bus stops/routes/bus stations WITH enough car parking for more than one double decker bus load!! Stop acting like the residents of an area have a choice, and make the decision to drive and sit in traffic!!

Less secret-squirrel discussions - let the locals decide what they want and not in silly forums in local halls that run through work hours so only the retirees can attend...

Waste is also an issue - I have now seen on several occasions, all the bins (recycling, rubbish and greenwaste/foodscraps) being emptied into ONE truck - together!! What on earth....!?!?!?

A magic wand across Auckland would be blink'n brilliant!

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal



#2322



Tell us why:

How are you going to make public transport faster without dedicated bus lanes (SH1 north of Albany being prime example)? Motorbikes and service vehicles/tour buses and passenger vehicles with 8 or more people should be able to use the bus lanes too perhaps? (unsure of the safety issue around the bus stops or these bus lanes though, or how that would be managed)!

We need to get Auckland flowing! It's the constant merging into the main highway north to south that slows the traffic from flowing. From Whangaparaoa to the City, it goes from 2 lanes to 3 lanes near Albany, to 2 lanes again not long after, to 5 lanes (to of which are merging in before cutting back off to Constellation), to 2 again, then 3, 4, 5, then 4 over the bridge... then chaos as people try to find their lane on the other side and often move across several lanes to find the right one... it's a nightmare... we need north to south lanes. There are a lot of people that travel a really long way to get to work - if they could sit in one lane, the majority of the way, I honestly believe we'd have a better flowing network.

Also, toll sections of the motorways (like fare stages on a bus). That should help pay for some of the infrastructure required!!

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Bus stops!! Carparking at bus stations!! Public bathrooms, lights, rubbish/recycling bins and outdoor taps at ALL public playgrounds!! If they can't have this, they shouldn't be there!! Expand and renew the current Leisure Centre facilities!!

Look at having household rubbish combined for some areas/streets into bigger skip bins rather than everyone having multiple bins blocking driveways, footpaths and tumbling onto roads (and ending up often in waterways).

Boat ramps and car parking (and facilities such as toilets) at beaches/bays etc... prime example, Gulf Harbour has the only concrete ramp on the Hibiscus Coast so it can take around 2hours to launch/exit on beautiful days (we don't own a boat - but see the chaos)!

Perhaps Council can invest in boat washing facilities nearby too (user pays)!

Dog parks (again, we don't own a dog, but see a need)!!

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?



#2322



Auckland Council have a lot of "Consultants" for every project and although they tender the work out - it's not often the 'cheapest' they go for. I understand cheapest isn't always best, but some of those tenders are intentionally massively over-inflated, and yet the contract is still awarded.

Consultants should become staff of Auckland Council, paid at a set rate to get the work done!

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

A multi use facility would be amazing. Could multiple clubs use this - ie. gymnastics/rollerskating (3 clubs in Auckland without their own facilities and scrambling to find places for their International Competitors to train)/trampolining (for indoor spaces/carparking areas of present), ball sports etc all combined... I feel there's a lot of value in creating "club" atmospheres - and in NZ, Rugby clubs still do this - but there isn't a lot around where these clubs run as corporate businesses and can have a bar/cafe onsite that you could go to day or night ... there could even be some accommodation for those travelling for training at the stadium or when hosting matches with out of Auckland teams etc...

Maybe an ice skating rink too?? There's a lot of space - it would be awesome to have lots of minority sports able to have a base to call home!!

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

There's obviously a disconnect between Council and the Airport right now anyhow, so, time for change!

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#2322



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Step back and allow for private management to come in.

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:

I believe the funds should be used to attract major and business events to Auckland. These often require a lot of subvention support and city led investment and bids are presented years in advance - some 10+ so need commitment now!

We need to liven the city up, showcase our new developments (City Rail Link, NZICC, Hotels etc) and attract these international guests that bring with them, foreign investment, new job opportunities, new skills, exchange of knowledge etc...

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#2322



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 for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 |



#2322



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

Hibiscus and Bays,Rodney

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#2322



| | |
|---|----------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

We need bus stops, we need better rubbish collections/recycling opportunities - especially in public places, we need more crossings (whether lights or zebra crossings - I cannot get my kids across Whangaparaoa Road 99% of the time.... it's a nightmare!!)

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Too weak! Be brave, bold and have some lofty targets. These are pretty lame and not very defined!!



#2322



Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Very Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Very Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Very Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Very Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Very Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Very Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Very Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Very Important |



#2322



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

This is such an important growth area with many younger families moving further north to try and buy/rent... and many aging/elderly downsizing in this area too.

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Leigh

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I can't afford more, ready to revolt.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2350



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

I'm not your ATM

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Everything

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

All of your schemes steal from the taxpayers who have it hard enough.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#2350



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 assets you short term visionary

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:

If you increase my expenses by a single dollar I will revolt

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?



#2350



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> | |



#2350



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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?

8. Do you have any other comments?

You have mismanaged funds for every single thing you touch and punish the tax payers because of it. NZ is dangerously close to an uprising and you're pushing it closer. Be careful.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop wasting money on raised crossings, cycle paths that very few make use of and direct that money towards things that are actually important



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need to get the city moving by better roads, better public transport, less raised crossings causing even more traffic congestion and less cycle ways that very few ever use

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Roads!

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised crossings, cycle ways, and a host of other expensive options that are not contributing to our economy

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It needs to be run as a business, generating revenue and development it can pay for through those revenues

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#2355



The fund is a great idea but should be funded from savings on current wastage, not rates increases

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?

Other

Tell us why:

Neither the Council or the Port are capable of managing these. For as long as either are or becomes just another endless pit of costs for which neither have budget. Privatise it!

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other



#2355



Tell us why:

As above

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>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>Support</p> |



#2355



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

Start employing responsible people and get rid of the zellots

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#2355



| | |
|---|------------------|
| community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

The focus should be on where it benefits most people, not special interest groups

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | 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?

Better, productive, infrastructure especially in the Silverdale area which is bursting out of it's seams with all the new developments popping up like mushrooms.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2368



Wasting taxpayer's money. For instance: We live in a street with approximately 20 houses bordering protective bushland. We were informed by the Council that an inspection was to take place to ensure compliance with the covenants. Instead of visiting the site in one day, and inspecting all the properties in one day, the Council inspector(s) made numerous trips on different days to this site to do the individual inspections. Why was so much time and money spent on Council Inspectors driving to the same site numerous times in one week to do an inspection that could have been done in one day? Unreal how much money is floating around at Council if they can approve these unnecessary trips that could have been economically planned as one trip.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Just get on with the important stuff and stop wasting time/money on 'nice to haves'.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

It does seem there is a lot of resurfacing happening on roads that still looks pretty good and can wait at least another year or two for a resurface. Please ensure money is not wasted on resurfacing a road just BECAUSE 'that's always been the plan'

Use common sense and be pro-active to not waste money on something which is not essential.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The stadium is one of the best-kept secrets for big events.... not only is there a huge bus stop station close by, there is also AMPLE parking in the vicinity of the stadium.



#2368



Surely this is an ideal location to host huge music events. It is mind moggling that huge music events are still being held at Mt Smart Stadium/Eden Park/Western Springs - which does not offer nearly as much benefits as North Harbour sadium in terms of: parking/accessability/close proximity to motorway/easy access in and around the stadium. NH stadium is also not built right in the centre of residential houses making it much easier and faster to leave after the event and not blocking all surrounding residential roads which is currently the case with all the forementioned stadiums.

Think out of the box and elevate NH Stadium into the number one destination for all big music concerts in future. Afterall, it can be argued that a big majority of the ticket holders are usually from the North Shore... (?)

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Be sensible and do what is good for the economic growth of Auckland.

Be future-focused. Think prosperity for the city and the people who live here.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Do what will create the most profit for the city and it's 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



#2368



Tell us here:

Do what is best in terms of economical growth for the city and it's people.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Develop it for the benefit of the people

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This 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 | Support |



#2368



| | |
|---|----------------|
| harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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 . | 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. | 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. | Support |



#2368



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



#2368



| | |
|---|------------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Put the rubbish bin back. Lots of people don't want to bring their rubbish home, already paid high city council rate. Why need pay more for the project without long term plan

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2383



Auckland Already is a highly cost living city. So don't be stupid have lots of new idea. Keep the same for few years. Let's have a rest. Get out from the covid environment.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Cost too much and never seen any changes. Only see the stupid reduction speed bump everywhere

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I don't want to see any expense

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Everywhere. Mainly is reducing the wages for the city council leaders

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Where does the money come from? Can you only do one project at one time?

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#2383



Can you do it as step by step. Don't jump

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Any idea to reduce the city council rate all good ideas

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



#2383



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>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</p> | |



#2383



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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?

Very bad plan. May I ask where the money come from ? Should walk step by step. The plan all seen like jump. Not step by step walking. Only one point : where the money come from ?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | |
|--|--|



#2383



| | |
|---|--|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | |

Tell us why

Wher the money come from ? We already have hard time to living at this stage. City council need more money year by year. And reduce the services. Too many new projects. We can't afford

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As 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 - rates shouldn't increase that much that people can't afford to live in their own properties - council needs to do more - there's so much on the hibiscus coast that needs doing - seems that council sit on their bum doing nothing

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



less bigwigs & do more in the community

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

why do we need to spend so much on raised pedestrian crossings - fix the roads that need fixing not the ones that don't

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Fixing the Hibiscus Coast dynamic lane - they spent money making it & for years & despite numerous complaints to AT a lot of the lane lights don't work. Also need to trim bushes, trees etc. on the footpaths

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?



#2386



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#2386



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> |
| <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>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> | |



#2386



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#2386



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

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?



#2393



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> |



#2393



| | |
|--|---------|
| <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 |



#2393



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Very Important |



#2393



| | |
|---|----------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

I don't believe in promoting partnerships with groups based solely on race.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Actually I think no 2 and 3 are soft , wordy and nonspecific... puffery would describe them both

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Bring back the rubbish bins and get rid of graffiti immediately.

I am ashamed of Auckland now. It is untidy, rubbish everywhere, weeds everywhere, tagging everywhere. Spend the money and TIDY IT UP!!!



#2401



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less of the woke

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need to sort this NOW.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Roads and potholes

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Dual language signs

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#2401



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

It should be for ours to use and appreciate

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:



#2401



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>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> |



#2401



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#2401



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Motorway congestion. On the North Shore it can take an hour (sometimes more) waiting to get on an ‘on ramp’ to the motorway. Then sit in congested traffic.

Mow the council owned berms/parks/road edging. The North Shore looks scruffy and unkempt to our visitors.



#2414



Put rubbish bins back at our beaches, we are trying to prevent rubbish blowing into the sea but the council then takes out the one thing people used to dispose their rubbish in. Visitors to the city are a great example of not being able to take it home.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop interfering with our home rubbish payment/collection. It should be a user pay system, not included in your rates as proposed. We only put rubbish out every 3 weeks so why should we pay for weekly collections.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Absolutely ridiculous waste of money putting in raised concrete near pedestrian crossing & roundabouts, harder for buses to get around too.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Keeping the environment up to date for our city, currently an embarrassment when bringing visitors to our area on the North Shore from the airport

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Council salaries

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

If it's not working now, get a management team in to make it work as we don't want to lose our stadium



#2414



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:



#2414



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 for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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). | 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. | 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 | Do not support |



#2414



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our | Not Important |
|--|---------------|



#2414



| | |
|---|------------------|
| community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As 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?



#2416



Cap the number of new residences until these issues are sorted. Rampant population growth without the infrastructure has led to the current issues

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Better public transport options will encourage more use. It is a mess right now and very inconvenient to use.

Raised pedestrian crossings are an unnecessary cost to rate payers.

Cycle-ways are an indulgence we can do without. Cycling is not an option for most commuters.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Not sure

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

As mentioned - raised crossings and cycleways.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It is a lot of rate payer's money to keep the stadium as it is. Make it useful to a wide variety of sports and cultural events seems a better option.

But please, not more high rise housing on the area.



#2416



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Rate payers need services now, not only in the future. Some services are being limited or taken away, and this seems wrong.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#2416



Tell us why:

Many harbour cities have beautiful waterfronts with many public amenities - Auckland waterfront is ugly and very industrial looking

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

as per 5a

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 | I don't know |



#2416



| | |
|---|--------------|
| businesses and raises the share paid 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. | 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?

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?



#2416



I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

When times are tight, and they are, some things have to be put aside and looked at again in the future. Ratepayers are not bottomless buckets of money.



#2416



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Long term proposals sound good, but can they be fulfilled? Many promises do not come to fruition when funds are tight.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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



#2467



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Public transport is weak at the moment. I used it lot couple of years ago but there appear to be less options these days forcing me to drive to work.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It is not really used and does not have sufficient public transport to handle big crowds

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Sound plan



#2467



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Time has come to sell and move the port.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Sounds like a good plan

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:

This is a great area to turn into public use as other big cities

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



#2467



Tell us why:

Would be of more use

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> |



#2467



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

No

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#2467



| | |
|---|------------------|
| community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

No comment

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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?

Delivery of active mode transport infrastructure

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



roading infrastructure that encourages private car use

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?

Delivery of active mode transport infrastructure

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

roading infrastructure that encourages private car use

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#2470



Tell us 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:

I would like Auckland Council to ensure the Future Fund invests 100% ethically.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#2470



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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 |



#2470



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

Hibiscus and Bays, Rodney, Upper Harbour

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



#2470



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I would like to see the Hibiscus and Bays priorities shifting to focus on providing safe active mode infrastructure and pedestrianization of town centers such as Orewa and Silverdale to create safe vibrant spaces for the the community. Private car use should be discouraged and public transport encouraged.

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#2470



| | |
|--|----------------|
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Very Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Very Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Very Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Very Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Very Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | I don't know |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities



#2470



Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | Very Important |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | I don't know |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | Very Important |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | Very Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | I don't know |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | Very Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.



#2470



We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

I don't know

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Focus on basic repairs and maintenance of roads and infrastructure

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2487



Stop all petty/woke projects like speed bumps, cycle ways and Maori-fication of road signs and other council materials or signs

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Rapid public transport is essential including fast connecting services. Currently public transport is not an option from the North Shore to example Greenlane/Ellerslie.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

transport and traffic management. Also make it safe and easy for motorbikes so more people can use motorbikes to commute safely.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

previously-planned initiatives, such as raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Not a current priority in the bigger scheme of things.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#2487



We need to cash to help with urgent council tasks

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Retain ownership so we can benefit from future dividends.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

We need the funding to fix current infrastructure

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

More trucks will mean more pressure on roads. Any change requires a lot of funding which we should spend on higher priority items.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#2487



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

There is enough other spaces available for public use e.g. further towards the viaduct and out towards Tamaki drive and Mission bay

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. 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 | Do not support |



#2487



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

I would like to see more transparency around income from rates and where the rates are spent. Example, What is the income from North Shore and where is that money spent? How much of our North Shore rates are used to subsidize other areas of Auckland?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays, Upper Harbour

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#2487



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Focus on basic infrastructure priorities before nice-to-have items.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#2487



Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | Not Important |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | Fairly Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | Not Important |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | Not Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | Not Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | Not Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Some of these questions have conflicting statements. e.g. Yes to Improve our local environment and pollution - no to unrealistic climate change plans.

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#2487



7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

None of the above

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

Focus on priority infrastructure items. Library is not a critical or urgent item to address at the moment.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Like all households, when you face a financial difficult time, you have to cut costs for nice-to-have projects and get back to basics.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Spend some of the money north of Albany. We are also part of Auckland but since we Amalgamated councils The whangaparaoa area has been neglected.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2490



Stop all the red tape and get on with the things that have to done to fix this city.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

To much spend on the city rail link.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

More pubic transport north of Albany. Bus lane north of Albany

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

***** road cones.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

North shore has no major stadium to hold events at.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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?



#2490



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#2490



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | Support |
| <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> | 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> | |



#2490



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#2490



| | |
|---|----------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Great

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2511



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#2511



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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



#2511



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> |
| <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> |



#2511



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna. | Fairly Important |
| Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces. | Fairly Important |
| Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan. | Not Important |
| Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu. | Not Important |
| Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses | Fairly Important |



#2511



| | |
|--|---------------|
| and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike. | |
| Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park. | Not Important |
| Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on | Fairly Important |



#2511



| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| <p>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>Fairly Important</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>Fairly Important</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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

The living cost has been so high and we could not feel any change for the money you spent. If you decide to increase the rates sharply and we could afford neither the rates but also the mortgage. Believe the council were hold to help the Aucklanders instead



#2525



of just getting money from the middle class to pay to the people not working. This is nonsense. We refuse the increase for land rates since the current is crazy high enough.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The traffic is pretty bad these days since we do not have good public transport. Some lines are not well designed and need to transfer a lot. Also, delays happen every day and the high fare stop people from taking it.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

not essential

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:



#2525



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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?

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?



#2525



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <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> |
| <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> | |



#2525



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

we've been struggling for lives since everything is crazy expensive these days. Please do not even think to make our burden harder.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#2548



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 we can continue to fund the 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> |



#2548



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | 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. | 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?



#2548



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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Please stop wasteful spending on raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.



#2549



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I support fixing the potholes and degraded or damaged roads.

For public transport, user should pay.

Raised pedestrian crossings are insanely expensive, we just need lines painted.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I support fixing the potholes and degraded or damaged roads.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

For public transport, user should pay.

Raised pedestrian crossings are insanely expensive, we just need painted lines.

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:



#2549



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:

I don't know that it's one or the other, if appropriate why not use a percentage to fund council services and a percentage in the Auckland future fund

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

As you say the proposal would significantly reduce the scale of port operations in Auckland with more shipments needing to be transported into Auckland by truck or rail.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#2549



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 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>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> |



#2549



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Not Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups | Fairly Important |



#2549



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Not Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Not Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Fairly Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Very Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Fairly Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Wainui

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Greater intensification in zoning. Make it easier/straight forward for small investors to develop property. Think further ahead when upgrading infrastructure.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2563



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Seems like a waste of a good investment when it's going to be spent on things that will likely not increase in any real monetary value.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#2563



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Do not support



#2563



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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> | |
| <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 |



#2563



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | 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?



#2576



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)?

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:



#2576



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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.

Do not support



#2576



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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</p> | Support |



#2576



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Not Important |



#2576



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

Just build a new harbour bridge please

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#2577



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
|---|-----------------------|



#2577



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>Do not support</p> |



#2577



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna. | Not Important |
| Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces. | Not Important |
| Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan. | Not Important |
| Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu. | Not Important |
| Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses | Fairly Important |



#2577



| | |
|--|------------------|
| and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike. | |
| Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park. | Fairly Important |
| Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances. | Not Important |

Tell us why

traffic congestion is the most important thing to improve

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

bad as the most important thing not in consideration at all - traffic congestion issue

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#2577



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

fairly good

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cut staff costs



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

N/a

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Penlink in Whangaparaoa

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle and walkways

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

N/a

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

N/a

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#2588



I don't know

Tell us here:

N/a

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

N/a

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

N/a

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

N/a

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

N/a



#2588



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>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>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> | |



#2588



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

N/a

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?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | I don't know |
|---|--------------|



#2588



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | I don't know |
| 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. | I don't know |
| 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. | I don't know |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

N/a

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?

Climate change adaption - speeding up the shift to a lower carbon economy

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2637



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Leasing will reduce our ability to change or adapt the use of the land.



#2637



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



#2637



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |



#2637



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#2637



| | |
|---|----------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improve transportation such as build three lanes between SH 1 Albany and SH 1 Wairau Valley (travel from north to south). The second harbor bridge.



#2641



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Food scraps collections.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Improvement on transportation increases efficiency and brings positive impacts on economy and life.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Improve transportation such as build three lanes between SH 1 Albany and SH 1 Wairau Valley (travel from north to south). The second harbor bridge.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Less on cycling & walking paths

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#2641



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

If the council services can be funded without increase the rate, the profit can go to Auckland Future Fund. Otherwise it should be used to fund council service.

4d. Do you have 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:

Proceed only if it align with the pay less and get less option.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#2641



Tell us why:

Don't do it when you do not have a plan for. It will only waste tax payer money.

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> |



#2641



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2656



Wasting money you don't have on te reo when everyone can read English. Pause the giant cultural movement until you can pay for sewerage and roads.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Rate charges will see people losing homes

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The bias towards stadia away from the northern suburbs is narrow minded given growth in the north

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Council should stick to being a basic service provider only. Not a social justice advocate of any kind.



#2656



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Running a port is not a core function

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:

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?



#2656



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 for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what 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>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</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |



#2656



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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. | |

6b. Do you have 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#2656



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Basic services need to be prioritised Sealed rural roads or pothole free roads clean and tidy beaches and parks

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Adequate



#2656



8. Do you have any other comments?

Council is a secular service provider not a social justice NGO stick with the basics stay inside a 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

In this economic climate asking Auckland rate payers to pay SIGNIFICANTLY more (19% over 3 years) without significant raises to salaries is preposterous at best. Especially when you still expect us to pay exorbitant amounts for public transport and provided little to no assistance when the floods happened or since. Shame on you. Council needs to slow down or rein in spending, especially on the way over budget



#2659



and over time CRL and other major capital expenditure projects until the economic climate stabilises and then appropriately reconsider these options. Reallocate funds set aside for these projects to improving infrastructure in the wake of the floods/cyclone. I would think the safety and security of your ratepayers is more important than these other strategic projects.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

In this economic climate asking Auckland rate payers to pay SIGNIFICANTLY more (19% over 3 years) without significant raises to salaries is preposterous at best. Especially when you still expect us to pay exorbitant amounts for public transport and provided little to no assistance when the floods happened or since. Shame on you. Council needs to slow down or rein in spending, especially on the way over budget and over time CRL and other major capital expenditure projects until the economic climate stabilises and then appropriately reconsider these options.

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?

Managing the public transport fares... 2-3x what you pay in other countries and it is cheaper to pay for petrol and drive

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

CRL. Should never have been approved in the first place.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:



#2659



While the stadium is the only one on the north shore. I personally have never been to a game there and it is easy enough to get to one of the other Auckland stadiums so don't think it has huge cultural value in 2024

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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



#2659



Tell us why:

If it's of no benefit to move it then just leave it. It doesn't need to become one of the ridiculous "shared spaces"

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 we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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). | 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. | Support |



#2659



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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 . | 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. | 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. | 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?

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?

I support most priorities



#2659



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Bigger priorities

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#2659



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

nothing

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less Māori involvement



#2665



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

There has been too much money wasted on T3 lanes, Speed cameras, speed bumps etc

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

speed bumps and pedestrian crossings with traffic lights

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Happy with what is there now

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

It will spread the risk rather than having it all in Auckland airport



#2665



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Reduces Auckland City debt

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Helps reduce the property rate rises

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

Keep costs down

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#2665



Money needs to be spent on water, sewerage etc first

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. | 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. | Support |
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide | |



#2665



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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 feel the food waste recycling bin is a waste of rate payer's money

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | I don't know |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 | I don't know |



#2665



| | |
|--|------------------|
| sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | Not Important |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | Fairly Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | Not Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Get the buses and ferries working so they can all link together. So there are not big delays between one service and the other

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

I don't know



#2665



Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2683



We do not want the compost bins that we have to pay for and do not use. I know people involved in the trial and that didn't work so why were they implemented. May council employees less - cut council jobs -streamline your processes

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?

How are you going to attract more bus drivers? The bus services are so unreliable most people are scared to rely on them.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Trains, road cones - way too many!!!

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Don't have the money to spend on this and would rather my rates didn't go up as cant afford them as it is.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:



#2683



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#2683



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>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>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> |



#2683



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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?

Waitematā

Waitematā Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitematā in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road. | Not Important |
| Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works. | Not Important |



#2683



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Phased delivery of improvements for Heard Park. | Not Important |
| Deliver services and programmes that support youth activation, leadership, and wellbeing, particularly in Newmarket. | Not Important |
| Develop programmes that improve perceptions of safety within the City Centre, and our town-centres. | Fairly Important |
| Support local communities to develop Emergency Planning & Readiness Response Plans. | Fairly Important |
| Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitemata including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Waitemata proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?

Everyone is financially struggling = please do not raise our rates!!!



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

more to help community/businesses safety

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less benefit on non-disable people,



#2702



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

It's been years and years but AKL transport unfortunately never get better, I'm interested in how AT will obtain trusts back from people.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

To decide future of the North shore stadium need to know it's utilization rate and also yearly income.

I wonder why the income can't cover it's maintenance.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#2702



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#2702



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |



#2702



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#2702



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

The bays community has been doing a great job so far, please keep up the good job we as residence are really appreciate every single one has contribute to this community.

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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?

Fully fund the maintenance and renewal of the existing infrastructure (including the backlog of road sealing and gravel application), prior to building any new infrastructure (such as the millions wasted on vanity projects).

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2715



Stop funding raised ped crossings that do virtually nothing for safety, but increase GHG emissions. It is incredible that with both Council and AT having declared climate emergencies, that any project that actively increases vehicle emissions is allowed to go ahead unless the safety (or other) benefits are phenomenal.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

Fund 100% of the maintenance and renewal need, then with the left over funds worry about building new assets. This is after all a legal requirement under the LGA.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Maintenance including resurfacing and regravelling of roads. There is a massive backlog while funds have been wasted on vanity and road safety projects.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Safety improvements that offer no benefit to safety, but are someone in AT's flavour of the month

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

With the ongoing growth of the North Shore and Rodney areas, formal recreation areas will become under greater pressure. While the form of the physical stadium and grounds may change over time, the retention of the grounds is essential.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



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?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

So long as basic port functions (such as international cruise etc) can function.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#2715



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> | |



#2715



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

Fully funding the maintenance and renewal of existing assets is a likely requirement under the LGA. It is obvious that for a number of years now that Council has been renegeing on this legal requirement in favour of investing in capital growth projects or many a vanity project that serve little benefit.

There is a need to stop thinking that the CBD will ever be a key attraction for the vast majority of Aucklanders. Focus on creating vibrant local communities rather than trying to convince yourselves that Queen St is somehow relevant in today's world.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

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?

Fixing the poor state of the roads and allowing us to use our vehicles more.

Public transport has far too much focus on it, the majority of us just want to use our cars.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Public Transport!

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The stadium is hardly used for any real purpose, it is a white elephant, make better use of it.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Sell the shares and fund the projects that need funding. don't pussyfoot around, just get the jobs done without all of the delays and borrowing that cause excess costs due to time frame.



#2733



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

I don't trust the council to make wise decisions around the management of POAL and the expenditure of funds.

Let a business that doesn't spend public money look after it and use the funds to get Auckland moving again while reducing the cost of living increases.

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:

Funding council services is a money pit, there is already too much ridiculous waste spending from people with no care.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

The central city is dead, the crime is out of control and it is certainly not a place of destination.

Stop trying to flog a dead horse and waste more money building something of no use.



#2733



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 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> |



#2733



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#2733



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Rubbish water roads

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cultural activities, arts,



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Get what we have working better

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle lanes

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Get more use out 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:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#2748



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#2748

| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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 |



#2748



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



#2748



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | 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?

We live rurally and so most of what we get back from paying our rates is reflected in waste management, police (I’m guessing) and roads. Our road like so many other rural roads, is not sealed and so regularly develops significant potholes which then damage our cars. Each time potholes occur, our community has to submit enough reports before a team of road works is sent to bodge up some ridiculous excuse for a fix which



#2777



leaves the road surface less steady or gets washed away a few days later when it rains.

These repeated patch-ups must cost more than just sealing the road in the first place.

I would like to see Auckland Council apply better logic to spending and resources and treat all communities like they matter. Higher rates?! Are you high?? How about you give us a bit of a break and just do your job properly in the first place for the existing rates- or drop our rates if you have no intention of ever truly fixing our roads.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop focusing on growth and re-invention. You are council of a Super City but living in it doesn't feel super- it's suffocatingly expensive and over populated. Auckland residents don't need more 'status', they need less pressures and a better life balance.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

"Dynamic lanes?" Whoever came up with that term is getting paid too much for spouting garbage. How about you save money on salaries of employing people who sit and think up this nonsense and redirect the budget into supporting existing projects and communities?

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Are you so out of touch with your people that you actually inserted this question in here?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

This is just beyond ridiculous, um, sure, I'd like to contribute less money towards people who collect high salaries for asking stupid questions.

-Dog licensing

-council rates



#2777



- food
- fuel
- road user charges
- electricity
- school fees
- building consents

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Make the most of what you already have. Life is already too demanding and expensive.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Either way I'll have no power or control over the outcome. I'm not a millionaire and so I can't buy shares and therefore make any real impact, and well, council is council and so it's a moot point.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:



#2777



I imagine that there are more components involved in this decision making process which I have no access to. Overall it would be nice to have a bit of a pay break during such hard Financial Times. Is this change a pressing matter or could it be put on the back burner until NZ economy recovers?

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:

Is this an issue which requires urgent attention? If not why bring it up during such hard times?

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

If it ain't broke don't fix it. Wait until the country is in a better financial state and perhaps then residents would be more receptive to this proposal.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

Ask again later

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Other

Tell us why:

Ask again later



#2777



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>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>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></p> |



#2777



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

Avoid any unnecessary schemes until the economy improves to keep cost of living as is or lower in order to win favour with your residents.

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | I don't know |
|---|--------------|



#2777



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Focusing on preserving and maintaining what we already have seems more realistic currently than investing in further growth and development.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Can't comment as I don't have a firm grip on the details. This survey has been quite the journey.

8. Do you have any other comments?

Same message throughout- I'd rather focus on maintaining existing service than on growth during such hard Financial Times.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

It's ideological and not practical for Auckland

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Bike lanes. Total waste of our money

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Use for concerts, hire out to schools

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#2812



Tell us 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:

Off set stupid greedy rates increases

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#2812



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Other |
| 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, | Do not support |



#2812



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?

Stop wasteful spending.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2850



Events and wasteful art display projects like the thousands of dollars mirror hanging in the street years ago.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I've seen Auckland transport waste over the years, not listening to what we really need and just going ahead, behind our backs with stupid proposals like cut the Gulf Harbour Ferry.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

High salaries of executives that do nothing like the water one with hundreds of thousands in salary.

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:



#2850



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#2850



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> | |



#2850



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#2850



| | |
|---|----------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | I don't know |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



#2896



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)?

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?



#2896



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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>Other</p> |



#2896



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?



#2896



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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Finish Glenvar Rd, with traffic lights.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Get people to mow their own berms



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

People need to be able to use and afford public transport.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Adding to electric vehicles.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Roadworks

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Sell off some of the land and use it for more things.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

No thanks



#2898



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:

Nope

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:



#2898



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>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> | |



#2898



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#2898



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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?



#2899



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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:



#2899



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> | |



#2899



| | |
|---|--|
| 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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

A second harbour crossing needed urgently

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Not getting value for money particularly post 2023 flood



#2908



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

No mention of a second harbour crossing

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Maintenance drains and creeks that led to flooding

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

High consultant fees

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Reducing operational costs of using stadium would result in increased usage

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?



#2908



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#2908



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | I don't know |



#2908



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



#2908



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Lobby council for a second harbour crossing

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?

1. Council should not be doing items which are primarily in the central govt area.



#2911



2. Council is not operating at an optimum level staff wise - excessive management to worker ratio which must be reduced, excessive number of communications, PR, legal and other support staff which needs rationalizing. If serious about doing same than front line services will not be affected but costs substantially reduced, I have personally been involved in doing same in a large netity,

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Mostly OK but users have to pay a higher percentage of costs. This should be done by increasing base fares and reducing low patronage services frequency

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I think electric buses may have a lower long term cost (i.e running costs covering capital costs) - not entirely sure about that - requires review.

On very high frequency routes maybe more double decker buses maybe more efficient

There is also a reasonable amount of fare dodging - higher fines and more enforcement should improve income in the long run

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

In some areas there appears to be too many new pedestrian crossings (e.g. East Coast Bays Rd) where center islands may be sufficient

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

There appears to be a level of incompetence in the people running the stadium. It is hard to see how the large population on the North Shore cannot support financially a medium sized stadium - I don't know enough to how to resolve this



#2911



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

Port and Airport are long term investments welcomed by any fund.

Selling & diversifying in the long term only ends up transferring some of the income to parasitical management professionals and thus financially is worse for the council.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 monopoly fully privatising will just result in parasitical retn rises on all Auckland businesses.

However in the past POA has been abysmally managed and politically interfered with - only need a stronger focus on proper directors and management, and remove political constraints interfering with same.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

It is an asset which profits should pay current bills



#2911



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Disagree with self insurance for larger amounts - negates the premise & benefits of insurance.

disagree with Future Fund as it just hands portion of profits to parasitical professionals

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

It is a small amount of land and will cost Auckland businesses a lot if POA is constrained, also council should not be spending funds to develop - costs should be left to private industry

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Auckland is going to double in size over the medium term - cannot reduce or constrain efficiency of the Port

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | Do not support |
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual | Support |



#2911



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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 |



#2911



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Very Important |



#2911



| | |
|---|----------------|
| in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

All sound good but also have to think of the costs versus benefits of each. Those which efficiently enhance community such as paths network. supporting activities seem to have the most "bang for the buck" whereas "further protection" if not managed very v

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

reduce crime rate

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2925



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

don't need better transport

2a. Is there anything you 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:

reduce cost - don't care about 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 lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#2925



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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.

Do not support



#2925



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <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>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>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>Support</p> |



#2925



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Not Important |



#2925



| | |
|---|---------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

the majority of the local population don't care about many of these - there should be other priorities that are more important such as crime rate, road safety for our children, and local amenities

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

the majority of the local population don't care about many of these - there should be other priorities that are more important such as crime rate, road safety for our children, and local amenities

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

We simply cannot afford it right now

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2957



Please only do the essentials. We are struggling financially with no increases and an increase in interest rates, petrol and everything else it seems. People cannot afford to get by

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We as the public are struggling right now. When interest rates lower, then we can do more

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Give money to charities and community groups that need it. They do so much good

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Everything!

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

Nothing right now. It is not the time

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#2957



Tell us why:

It's not the right time

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

It's a source of money in, other than the taxpayer

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Money in

4d. Do you have 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



#2957



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>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> |



#2957



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Very Important |
|--|----------------|



#2957



| | |
|---|----------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Our environment is very important. Cuts back crime and makes people take pride in their surroundings

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

We need to hold off more. People cannot afford most proposals right now. Only the basics. Keep the environment as green as possible and tidy. No new developments or initiatives at the moment please

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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 events and fun for everyone (of all ages) to recover the economy (help businesses) and increase visitors back to Auckland

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2959



Stop increasing the costs of living in Auckland. Its no wonder people are leaving, and you need to look at what is not working and either make it redundant or fix it.....like better public transport. Public transports costs so much for no reason. Look at other countries transport system and how its working and implement it in Auckland. The Transport Plan is BS and its the same ***** we have heard before and its not going to work.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

your proposal is about: "making public transport faster, more reliable and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay and introducing capped weekly public transport passes"

What it should be is how can I get commuters there cheaper, quicker, on time and commuters should have access to transport to get anywhere in Auckland without worrying about catching four buses to get to work - and potentially missing a bus and being late

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Making Auckland accessible in the instance of you can get anywhere in Auckland using Public transport

Also fix the infrastructure for the flooding, so the past with flood issues do not repeat

Also create more free parking everywhere. Why are we building homes that are six bedrooms and only 2 car spaces in the driveway - in whos right mind is that proper. If your making tight roads have yellow lines that AT needs to enforce.

Manage space efficiently for new roads for extra onsite parking instead of plants and trees.

Make new roads wider for one car to have enough space to go at the same time as another.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?



Stop increasing the costs for transport (including the petrol) when public transport is not reliable to begin with.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

if its having maintenance issues fix those issues due to H&S but if its functioning then that's not money well spent.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

To bring money into Auckland, and a new person running the port may improve its services.

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



#2959



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

Look at what's not working in the city and look at how to improve the quality of life - not make it worse. Have you noticed the amount of tight roads Auckland has and there's nowhere to park -which is another problem in itself

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

I am up for making the city accessible, but do not increase transport costs -including transport fares. You are increasing costs but not wages.... you tell me how that is fair

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



#2959



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Water Quality Targeted 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 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 | Support |



#2959



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#2959



| | |
|---|----------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No, i don't want to pay more. I already pay enough

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#2961



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

I don't want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

I don't want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#2961



I don't want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

I don't want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

I don't want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#2961



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

I don't want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes

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 want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes

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>Do not support</p> |



#2961



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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 |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I don't want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes



#2961



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?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and | Not Important |



#2961



| | |
|---|---------------|
| other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

I don't want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I don't want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes

8. Do you have any other comments?

I don't want to incur any extra costs. Council rates area already extremely high, House valuation are extremely inflated while we are at one of the worst times for real-estate market. you are making it almost impossible for Kiwi to own their homes



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | As proposed |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop building roads that take ages to complete. The construction sites themselves impose huge pressure on the traffic. The traffic is better off without the construction works.



#2962



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#2962



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 |



#2962



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | Do not 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> | 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 |



#2962



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | |



#2962



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.

Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?



#3005



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#3005



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. | 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 |



#3005



| | |
|--|--------------|
| <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> | 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 |
| <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 |



#3005



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and | Not Important |



#3005



| | |
|---|------------------|
| other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | As proposed |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

How about getting rid of those “this park can’t be maintained due to ground conditions” signs? They are a waste of money. In general I feel the council is burning through a



#3014



serious amount of money that I have to work for, and I have very little say over what happens.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

The council should not invest money on my behalf, leave that to me and reduce my rates.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know



#3014



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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



#3014



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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> |



#3014



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Fairly Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Fairly Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Fairly Important |



#3014



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Not Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Not Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Not Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Silverdale (Rodney End)

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | |
| 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?

Just do your best with less cost to us! Cost of livis is too high if you make the rates higher we wont be able to live. And might choose to migrate to ither country or move to a different city

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3018



Make the food scraps optional!

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?

Prioritising managing the cost of living! Helping out low and medium income owners like me to cope up with the high cost of living!

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Unecessary projects and impractical projects

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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:

Do what is best to for the people to lift them up from high cost of living

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:



#3018



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>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>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></p> |



#3018



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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?

Hibiscus and Bays,Rodney

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#3018



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#3018



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Fairly Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Fairly Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Fairly Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | I don't know |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities



#3018



8. Do you have any other comments?

Keep cost of living low for the people to have a livable auckland life or else people will suffer and move out the city or the country



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Water quality is important

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less bus service. No one uses it except school kids



#3025



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Less investment in bus services. More focus on traffic flow

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Busses

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Useless structure. Even when there are events there is it empty

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Investment fund makes more sense than assets in a single entity like the airport

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#3025



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Lease the property and rather get council involvement reduced. Let private industry get on with the running and council collects a fee

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:



#3025



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>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>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> |



#3025



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#3025



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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 concerns are highest on my list. I would like more resilience built into our services, while improving transportation options to help with climate change.
Promoting public transport options, less reliance on roads/cars.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3061



I am less interested in council funding of events to promote visitors. This should be more of a private sector concern.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Living on the Northshore, I can't say I feel like we are in any way helped by the proposal. All investment (other than roads) seems aimed at other areas. Some investment that isn't more roads would be welcome.

2a. Is there anything you 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:

In the last 5 years, I have been to the precinct once, while I go to Albany most weeks. Something that would make the area more usable for more people would be great.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

I am all for diversifying the assets of the council.



#3061



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

I am unsure as to why having a giant port in downtown Auckland is a good choice. Some of the best cities I have visited over the world have a wonderful waterfront for living, not congestion from moving freight through the main city centre.

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:

A vibrant waterfront is an important part of a city, and a great attraction for visitors.

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



#3061



Tell us why:

A vibrant waterfront is an important part of a city, and a great attraction for visitors.

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>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>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> |



#3061



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#3061



| | |
|---|------------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | I don't know |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Seems rather general in that summary, I don't have a real feel for the priorities.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No. I do not want to pay more for anything. It has become overwhelming and out of reach for many families to feed themselves let alone care about building millions of dollars of roads/ update a stadium.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3068



Cut back food taxes/ petrol tax and reduce our rates. Cut/ remove from our bills the dump green organic food scrap bin. I don't want it- it's called compost!!! Not a green bin

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

What a complete waste of money. Our transport system sucks because we don't have trains. We do not need 'updated buses services' there is too much traffic on the road. We have no infrastructure- no rail! So this is a waste of money widening a road- updating what? The amount of people is disproportionately high to just update a road. We have no way of getting into the city for work other than car! You don't have enough bus drivers, you don't pay them enough and we need a cycle lane over the bridge to commute. And a rail for Northshore/ west/ east and south! Move with the times Auckland!!!!!!!

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Absolutely nothing.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Your salaries

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Don't spend \$33 million on a stadium.



#3068



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Give back to the local iwi which it was stolen from.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:



#3068



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 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>Support</p> |
| <p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#3068



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

As my feedback above

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Rodney

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities



#3068



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna. | Very Important |
| Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces. | Fairly Important |
| Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu. | Not Important |
| Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park. | Fairly Important |
| Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities



#3068



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#3068



Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Fairly Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Not Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Not Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Not Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Fairly Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Not Important |



#3068



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Rodney

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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?

The libraries should do more of everything, offer more services, loan more stuff.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



No. We should demand more.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Continue to provide raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Auckland is broke as *****

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know



#3091



Tell us 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



#3091



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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). | 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. | I don't know |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | Support |



#3091



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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?



#3096



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?

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>Support</p> |



#3096



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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. | 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?



#3096



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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 more |
| Parks and Community | |
| 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?

Force Vector to improve the electrical grid resiliency! In Browns Bay older areas, EVERY SINGLE storm knocks out power. 10 years living there, we have close to 30 (!) power outages. One lasting for 30 hours!

Vector and Entrust is unfairly subsidising Central-Auckland from everyone else.



#3098



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

You must spend on traffic light synchronisation. I just don't get why it doesn't happen? The tech is available for 30 years! This would speed up traffic more than building any more roads.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Zero spend on non electric buses.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

\$33M for very few people's entertainment is a bad deal.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#3098



A "professional fund manager" will take a huge cut for zero foresight. You might as well play it on poker.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Look at Sydney's Linkt and motorways. Developed on taxpayer money now a company is running it for profit...

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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



#3098



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>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> |



#3098



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who | Not Important |
|--|---------------|



#3098



| | |
|---|------------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

It only "advocate"-s. I'm not sure we are paying people from our taxes to advocate to people from our taxes. Get rid of both and you'll have more money to do what's necessary.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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 at the moment

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No at the moment



#3099



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

No comments

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No at the moment

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No at the moment

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

If they are not good, change it.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Once you do that, you will lose some passive income



#3099



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Give the operations to the professionals.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 comments

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

No comments

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

No comments

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#3099



Tell us why:

No comments

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>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> |



#3099



| | |
|---|---------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

No comments

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna. | Not Important |
|--|---------------|



#3099



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces. | Fairly Important |
| Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan. | Not Important |
| Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu. | Not Important |
| Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park. | Very Important |
| Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances. | Not Important |

Tell us why

No comments

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

No comments

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities



#3099



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

No comments

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

No comments



#3099



8. Do you have any other comments?

No comments



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do 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?



#3113



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think a more efficient public transport system benefits the most people and is essential for a modern city and to attempt to meet our obligations under the Paris Agreement. Investment in public transport systems in NZ is always severely insufficient.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Not sure about spending more council money but I think JVs with private reputable companies (eg HEB and the like) need to be utilised more with tolls for more efficient transport infrastructure, systems and routes. Need to consider whether the tolls are forever appurtenant to the structure to allow for continued maintenance funding and reinvestment or if tolls end upon repayment of the debt owed to the JV.

Work out a better system with bus companies - focus on more and better training, very attractive remuneration and staff benefits, focus on creating better working environments with a goal to increase staff retention (especially newly trained staff).

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It always looks empty.

Alternatively, move all the big events that are held anywhere else on the North Shore to the stadium to make it worth keeping.



#3113



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Diversification of investments is often the best option to spread risk.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Leasehold land is a cash cow. Privately operated ports might be more efficient but specific lease terms that prevent a private port operator from increasing costs to the general logistics operators and therefore to end consumers are absolutely essential. Regular review and penalty terms must be imposed and enforced to ensure a private operator is not price gouging. Caution must be taken if this option is implemented.

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:

Only if the returns on the investment will be more than the investments themselves and those returns are then spent on the services.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#3113



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Diversify the use of the wharves. Hopefully income generating if they are used for something else.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The alternative of having to increase rail and road is counterproductive and terrible for Auckland traffic.

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> |



#3113



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |
| <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> |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#3113



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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Focus on important day to day. Stop wasting money on art, movie in park, festivals, park events, culture, mauri language signes, electrical vehicles or its chargers.



#3142



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Public transport network is insufficient, more roads better than public network or tge dreamers of bike lanes.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Increas parking capacity at park and ride in Albany and font charge people park in streets in Albany.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No bike lanes, Reduce number of bus services that are running almost empty. No subsidies to bus companies. Concentrate on excepress buses rather than buses in suburban areas.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It should generate money rather than it is being empty all times. Tge community house to be in the stadium and lease out the community house that is across the road, Turf should be hired not free to use, make other parts to generate money such as install solar power generation pannels free of charge by companies that like to invest and pay percentage to the stodum,

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#3142



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#3142



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>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>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> |



#3142



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
|---|---------------|



#3142



| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Reduce spending

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

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 fuel tax if needed to keep money for better public transport/connecting services withing auckland

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Fuel

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Public transport

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



#3154



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#3154



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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 |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, | I don't know |



#3154



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped | Not Important |



#3154



| | |
|---|----------------|
| reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Update the guidance on rural areas that would clearly no longer be deemed as "rural" as far as new suburban developments go that. An example is Stillwater, whereby rubbish, mail and other free services that are given to suburban areas have to be paid for privately even though it's 5min down the road from Silverdale with over 2000 residents.



#3163



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Have less exemptions for Maori owned land whereby land is deemed unusable for silly reasons like gorse. There is a lot of land could transform local communities or provide housing or other services is managed appropriately but if they're not being charged for it then there's no incentive to make use of it.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

The government supports the airport enough and it's a simple way for the council to fund some of it's future without raising rates.



#3163



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

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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?



#3163



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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> | |



#3163



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#3165

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#3165



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

At the moment there is no need to spend more on making public transport faster, and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay and introducing capped weekly public transport passes

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Road maintenance

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

spending on raised pedestrian crossings and changing speed limits and slow speed zoning

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

When TAU took over they purposely ran down the stadium and started to over charge for its use then they destroyed half the bank.

That stadium was fought hard for by local residents it is an asset that belongs to the shore and it must be stolen by the city to fund things that don't benefit the North Shore.

Under the former trust that ran it it held a lot of successful events, tournaments etc.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



#3165



Tell us why:

Once an asset is gone, it is gone for good and we no longer receive any benefit and have no say in its management.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

The port is on valuable land. most modern cities do not have ports on their prime water frontage anymore. Apart from cruise ship operations which bring in tourist the port must relocate to north port which is a logical location for this sort of activity. The water front can then be developed for public use and the remaining land will be prime real estate which can be sold off for a good profit.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

If its smart investment it should provide a good ongoing return for the city.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

Its great to redevelop into public spaces but we must insure the city retains space for the cruise ships which is important for the cities tourism



#3165



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

The port should no longer be a priority for the inner city these spaces must be redeveloped for the benefit for the city.

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>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>Support</p> |



#3165



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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?

The Council must stop looking to the rate payers to provide a slush fund for them to continue to dip into. The rate payers cannot afford to continue to accept the never ending increase to their rates

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?



#3165



I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

The need for improvements to East Coast Road, Glenvar rd, Okura river road and Vaughan roads was recognized by the former North Shore city, plans were drawn up and money was set aside. That money was stolen by the Super city and this project has been she



#3165



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As above - East Coast Road, Glenvar rd, Okura River road and Vaughan roads is the biggest priority for the area

8. Do you have any other comments?

The council must stop using the rate payers as a never ending slush fund



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Reduce council staff specially the ones who are taking very high salaries.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3175



Ease people , intrest rates are already ruining do you want people to beg and put in fill your tummies.

You guys wasted billions on cycle tracks and city metro just a waste of money. We elected Wayne Brown to cut the cost and make more efficient. But he have just team of nuts who are just putting more burden on common man.

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?



#3175



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Do not support



#3175



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> | <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>Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura 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> | |



#3175



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Not Important |



#3175



| | |
|---|---------------|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Less road cones

Less road humps



Less speed cameras

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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



#3177



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Invest in 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?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Do not support



#3177



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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, | Do not support |



#3177



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped | Not Important |



#3177



| | |
|---|------------------|
| reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us 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



#3183



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

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</p> | <p>Support</p> |



#3183



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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 . | 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 |
| Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?



#3183



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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |



#3183



Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Very Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | 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?

Strengthen education and manage public security

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3203



Cancel light rail construction, cancel fuel taxes, do not build unnecessary roads and facilities, and stop some previously planned projects, such as raised crosswalks and bicycle lanes.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Too low efficiency

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council'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?



#3203



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Do not support



#3203



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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 |



#3203



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |



#3203



| | |
|---|--|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less weed spraying - better for our health and the environment

Less regulations - less bureaucracy



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?

Speed bumps, these not only cause installation costs but ongoing costs for all motorised vehicles by increasing fuel usage

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:



#3220



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to fund 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:

4d. Do you have 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:

An increase in truck and rail transport into Auckland should be absolutely avoided.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Do not support



#3220



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> | <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>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>I don't know</p> |



#3220



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



#3220



| | |
|---|---------------|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I support most priorities.

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?

Infrastructure that keeps the city moving and working.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3230



Regulatory spend - rely on the private sector more. It shouldn't take 30 people at Council to review designs of subdivisions, etc. lean on the private sector and make them more responsible instead of investing so heavily in checking everyone's work.

Environmental spend - leave it to the private sector. Focus on getting infrastructure up to standard.

Cultural spend - it's not the Councils job to provide investment in this area.

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?

Roading network.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Tinkering with existing roads through adding raised tables, speed bumps at traffic lights, etc. get the big picture and priorities sorted before you start looking for the 1% improvements.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

More events at the stadium would be great. It's currently severely under-utilised.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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:

Funds can be allocated better elsewhere.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#3230



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>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</p> | |



#3230



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
|---|------------------|



#3230



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

Please protect beaches and reserves from erosion

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

user pays eg toll roads rather than blanket payments make it more user pays eg if you dont pay rates you pay - not just living in AUckland actually paying rates....its the rate payer who is funding things not the renters

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3231



Less payrises for councillors and management as we are not all getting payrises and you guys are already paid far more than the rate payers

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

raised pedestrian ramps are a ridiculous waste of money and dont make the crossing safer but rather a hazard for motorists. disabled people cant use bike lanes - its about making things equitable not targetting specific parts of society

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

cutting spending. look at user pays not everyone pays. TOll the central city dont have those of us who never go into the city paying for those road users...

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

rubbish initiatives - once again user pays if you want to have environmental savings pay more for land fill waste and make it free to dump the waste to the rubbish stations rather than having rubbish runs for those useless pinkl bags that disintegrate

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



#3231



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

shorted lease than 35 years and make it a condition to upgrade the wharves etc.....

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

fund future proofing such as storm water etc...

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

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



#3231



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>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>Do not support</p> |



#3231



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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?

I think user pays for refuse. I have next to no waste so why should I pay for those who throw everything out and fill huge bins. we should not have to pay rates for refuse collection and then pay again for rubbish collection its either included or not. I support user pays. we are meant to be reducing waste and the suggestions of pay pay dont equate to reduction.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#3231



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Fairly Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Fairly Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Not Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Not Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Fairly Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Not Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

prioroity should be on foreshore stabilisation



#3231



As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Silverdale (Rodney End)

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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 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?

Anything to improve traffic especially on the North Shore.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3260



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?

Wider roads, meaning more lanes.

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:

Make use of the stadium. Bring in shows, events, games....

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#3260



Focus on the city infrastructure and people, not on the operation of a company. Make money out of it and safe on its operation too. Lease to an specialised company and the port will also run smoother.

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:

They are not actually used by the port... allow people/companies that can make more of it for the people to manage it

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?



#3260



| | |
|---|---------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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. | 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. | |



#3260



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#3260



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | 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?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycleways. It's 21st century, this country is still in the 1980's.

Buslanes and buses in general. SO far it's cars, cars and cars everywhere. 95% of them with the driver only.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

More roads instead of more busways. Public transport is the key

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#3265



Tell us 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.

Do not support



#3265



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |
| <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> |



#3265



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Not Important |



#3265



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do 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?



#3272



Stop Food scraps collections. People have many ways to dispose the food scraps, e.g. compost at home, food waste disposer etc.. that have been around for ages. The food scraps bin is a bio hazard to handle.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland is still a relative small city in international standards, do not need to over-spend on public transport. More people are working from home or flexible work is more prevalent than nowadays.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It's a waste of money to maintain a stadium that is not being used. Consider a low budget redevelopment, and sell out some of the land to the private sector

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#3272



Good to diversify investments and save money for the future

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Always better to leave it to the private sector for better utilisation

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:

Save for the future

4d. Do you have 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:

Ship transportation is more economic and fuel efficient than trucks, keeping port operation is good

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#3272



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Ship transportation is more economic and fuel efficient than trucks, keeping port operation is good

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. | 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. | I don't know |
| 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 | Do not support |



#3272



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#3272



| | |
|---|------------------|
| 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. | I don't know |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

At this stage I don't feel I get what I pay for now, money spent on ridiculous things and the planning of stuff is ludicrous.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3316



As above where does money go, roads built that can't even cope with the now let alone the future. This is just money wasting.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

It for the now, just wasted money on bus lanes and not enough parks for people to use.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Sport

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

The shore needs this.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#3316



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?



#3316



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> | |



#3316



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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?

Upper Harbour

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | Not Important |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | Not Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | |



#3316



| | |
|--|--|
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

Investigate options to sell land

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?



#3316



8. Do you have any other comments?

Increased rates will see people put into hard ship particularly now the building economy is not stable and with current interest rates it will break people. It's a circle cause businesses owners will be asked to pay workers more but many people are not able.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Where is the forward planning for a second harbour crossing from Roth short Auckland city, there needs to be one in the next ten years

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Get some use and revenue out of it, more events

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Doesn't the debt outweighs the income currently

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#3338



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#3338



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <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>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>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>I don't know</p> |



#3338



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Not Important |



#3338



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Rail based public transport

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Stop spending on services and facilities that enable cars

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We need all of the original public transport, walking, cycling and plans implemented and motor vehicle speed reduction policies and facilities improved for the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. This includes installing all of the planned speed humps.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Non road based public transport (rail, ferries, cycling and walking).

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cars!

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Keep the land for sport and recreation but reduce the size of the stadium so that its better to manage.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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



#3349



Tell us why:

Easy income for Auckland in its current situation. The airport will increase revenue for the city over time benefiting all Aucklanders.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Retain ownership but move it away from downtown Auckland.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

see airport entry.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

.



#3349



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:

Ports of Auckland need to move away from down town Auckland as the city has outgrown the port.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property. | 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. | 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. | Do not support |



#3349



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere 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?

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

NO

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3376



cut the Speed Bumps and raised crossings . less investment in Cycle lanes as I seldom see cyclist using them . and I travel around Auckland a lot

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Traffic management is the most expensive item for all those who use it . even when the water dept are digging on the front of a property there is no requirement as all personel are away from the roads , but there is always a large team standing around all day . , Raised speed bumps are destroying vehicles suspension

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

making travel around Auckland easier . undoing all the restrictions put in place to reduce the flow of traffic , as most Aucklanders do not work on Public Transport routes ,

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

I Cannot remember the last time there was an event there that drew crowds over the last 15yrs , the sale of the Stadium funds could go towards a great Auckland Stadium that is always being talked about

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



#3376



Tell us 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:

There has to be smaller rates increases for Aucklanders and this option appears to give the best return and should reduce council operating costs .

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Rates increases are out of control and all available revenue needs to be channeled into running the greater Auckland today not in the future .

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

there has always been pie in the sky talk about the great Auckland Stadium



#3376



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:

future development that has always been talked about for the great Auckland Stadium

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>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> |



#3376



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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?

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?

I support all priorities



#3376



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

the East Coast Bays are always host to people from greater Auckland , our beaches are aways packed over Summer with Bus loads comming from all around Auckland . there also needs to be a Major clean up of all the Waterways that lead to the ocean .

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#3376



good

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

reduce the staff level



#3390



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

auckland traffic is get worse day by day. support the unnecessary spending and the over spending on raised crossing and bike lane

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

no

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



#3390



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Do not support



#3390



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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). | 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. | 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 |



#3390



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Has the Council looked at charging for rubbish collection for Central and East Auckland as they already do for North Shore?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Do not use Public Transport as it is currently not suitable for my needs

2a. Is there anything you 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:

The Stadium is currently a focal point for sport on the North Shore - just 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)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

The Council needs to keep Grandiose plans "in a box".

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#3415



Tell us 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:

The Council has enough on it's plate!

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

Other



#3415



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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 |



#3415



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped | I don't know |



#3415



| | |
|---|------------------|
| reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I would be prepared to pay more for increased climate resilience.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3440



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think the continued improvement of public transport is essential for the health of the city long term, so I think that is worth the money.

I worry that dynamic lines could cause more traffic accidents, but I can accept that it is more cost effective than adding more lanes to a road.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

I don't think the stadium is really needed or fully used. Living locally, whenever I drive by it is usually empty. I think the idea of redeveloping or selling the stadium makes a lot of sense in light of that.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#3440



| | |
|---|----------------|
| the protection of native ecosystems 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). | 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. | 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. | 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 |



#3440



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



#3440



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Public transport

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Build new roads



#3448



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Important to increase public transport and reduce reliance on cars. Would like to see spending on cycling as part of that

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport, cycle ways

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

New roads

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It is a great asset and should be used to its full potential.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Makes sense to make better use of our assets



#3448



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Move the port, develop the land as a communal space

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:

More long term planning and funding is needed

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council 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:

Modern cities aren't centered around industrial areas



#3448



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>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> | |



#3448



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | I don't know |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#3448



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Priorities seem very vague, no information on specific proposals or investments.

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Vague

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

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



#3460



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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>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>Support</p> |



#3460



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?



#3460



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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Traffic management. The traffic on the roads is outrageous.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#3463



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Get Auckland moving.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Accelerate smart traffic management technology and time-of-use scheme.

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



#3463



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

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



#3463



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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> |
| <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> |



#3463



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective | Fairly Important |



#3463



| | |
|---|------------------|
| options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

Get people into the great outdoors and make New Zealand beautiful again!

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Fine

8. Do you have any other comments?

Just get Auckland moving.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improve transportation!

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3469



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#3469



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?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <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> |



#3469



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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?



#3469



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?

I do not support any priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |



#3469



Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?

Improve basic 3 stages of water , waste, storm and fresh and coordinate with power and broadband services to work together on infrastructure.

We need retention tanks for storm water , less iwi and Consultants and more money spent on the doing rather than the bureaucracy



#3478



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Get rid of consultants and pen pushers

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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



#3478



Tell us 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



#3478



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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, | Support |



#3478



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped | Not Important |



#3478



| | |
|---|------------------|
| reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | 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?

Rubbish is a core service and should remain two weekly for the sake of public health.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3489



Do less of everything that is not core business. We need to prioritise rubbish, infrastructure, transport etc and do less of needs to have like supporting events etc.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

We do not need cycle ways and elevated pedestrian crossings. We also need to be car friendly because our public transport is totally inadequate, unreliable and frankly broken. It cannot be relied on to get to important appointments.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Quality of roads, removal of parking along congested roads such as Constellation Drive

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycle ways and elevated gold plated pedestrian crossings.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

Great stadium, the only one on the shore

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



#3489



Tell us why:

Makes sense

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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 need a war chest for unexpected calamities such as the Auckland Anniversary floods

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

We have waterfront land that could be better used for recreation



#3489



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 for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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. | Support |
| Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in | Support |



#3489



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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. | 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#3489



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Cut down on your council staff salary increase. The management staff are paid in six figures and what do they contribute? Nothing is improving well and our rates keep going up. It doesn't benefit me at all living in gulf harbour suburb. The road repairs needed on my street is always being repaired in the wrong section of the street. I have given feedback but nothing is being done to reseal the portion right outside my house



#3496



section and kids are tripping over because of the loose small stones and hitting car windscreen when cars are driving past my house area.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the high salary of your management staff and do a salary review and stop wastage on unnecessary spending.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

The raised pedestrian crossing and cycleways are stupid idea and should be removed altogether.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Do better road repairs in area quickly n make sure the contractor use quality sealant tar on the road so that the loose stones don't kick up easily n damage cars when we drive on the roads.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Stop repairing road section where it is not needed and seal up section where it is really needed.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Doesn't concern me at all as the stadium is rarely used.



#3496



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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?



#3496



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 for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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. | 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 | Do not support |



#3496



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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. | |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te | Not Important |
|---|---------------|



#3496



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Not Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Not Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Very Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities



#3496



Rodney

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3503



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Don't support charge at Park and Rides but bring back the 24hour parking time limit.

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#3503



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 |



#3503



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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> | I don't know |



#3503



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



#3503



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.

Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Very Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Surf lifesaving clubs play a vital role in our community, providing essential services to

keep our beaches safe. However, many of these facilities are reaching end-of-life and are

in need of replacement. Without adequate funding, our clubs will struggle to continue



#3511



their lifesaving work effectively.

Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the

Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf

lifesaving club facilities, as per SLSNR's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:



#3511



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
|---|--|



#3511



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted 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



#3511



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

With regard to Question 1C, Council has a central proposal that recommends spending

more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our

community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is

essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers.

The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



#3514

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

It is under utilised.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#3514



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:

We do not need another stadium.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

As above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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



#3514



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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>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>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> |



#3514



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Fairly Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Fairly Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Fairly Important |



#3514



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Not Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Not Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Fairly Important |
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Fairly Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Silverdale (Rodney End)

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Surf lifesaving clubs play a vital role in our community, providing essential services to keep our beaches safe. However, many of these facilities are reaching end-of-life and are in need of replacement. Without adequate funding, our clubs will struggle to continue their lifesaving work effectively.



#3517



Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the

Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf

lifesaving club facilities, as per SLSNR's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:



#3517



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--|
| Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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 | |



#3517



| | |
|--|--|
| <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>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other 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> | |



#3517



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

With regard to Question 1C, Council has a central proposal that recommends spending

more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our

community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is

essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers.

The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Surf lifesaving clubs play a vital role in our community, providing essential services to

keep our beaches safe. However, many of these facilities are reaching end-of-life and are

in need of replacement. Without adequate funding, our clubs will struggle to continue



#3525



their lifesaving work effectively.

Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the

Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf

lifesaving club facilities, as per SLSNR's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?



#3525



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | |
|---|--|



#3525



| | |
|--|--|
| <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> | |



#3525



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

With regard to Question 1C, Council has a central proposal that recommends spending

more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our

community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is

essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers.

The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

- Surf lifesaving clubs play a vital role in our community, providing essential services to keep our beaches safe. However, many of these facilities are reaching end-of-life and are in need of replacement. Without adequate funding, our clubs will struggle to continue their lifesaving work effectively.



#3536



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per SLSNR's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#3536



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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> | |



#3536



| | |
|--|--|
| <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?



#3536



- With regard to Question 1C, Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centers, as well as civil defence centers during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle.

- Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More accountability- so many issues have been present for 5, 10, even 15 years. The average rate payer is not seeing any benefit.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Staffing

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?

Widening/more lanes on arterial routes and main highways

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Raised crossings

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

Only main stadium on north shore. Near a key transport link of Albany bus station

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

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?



#3538



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#3538



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> | <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>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> |



#3538



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Not Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |



#3538



| | |
|---|---------------|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Not Important |

Tell us why

You have to cut spending. Most of these areas are not core/important areas. Get your finances in order before looking at further “fluff”

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: Hibiscus and Bays

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 | 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?

We need the litter bins that have recently been removed to be replaced

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

reduce bus services where they run empty or almost empty



#3541



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Bus fares should be user pay basis - more subsidies will just increase rates. Also as mentioned in the previous section there are many buses running empty outside of rush hour in and around the Hibiscus Coast - an amazing waste of money. I imagine its the same across suburban Auckland

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Roads, Water, Sewers, Parks - these are the core services that rates should be spent on

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Anything which is not a core service

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

It is hard to imagine any council anywhere in the world who would propose to demolish a funtional stadium - we just need people with business acumen to market it

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



#3541



Tell us why:

It is hard to see how jiggling with the investments will do much other than free up the capital gains on holding the shares allowing those capital gains to become as a source of revenue

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Shake up the Port Management and board to get the best dividend returns from the business

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Its an investment which should provide a stream of income to add to the budget and if we live withing our means it will reduce rates

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

The big issue is staring us in the face - the wasted money paying wages, fuel, depreciation, maintenance etc on fleets of buses trundling around the city outside of rush hours with no one other than the drivers on them. As well as the massive cost in funding this, we also are adding to greenhouse gasses with this.

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?



#3541



Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

We could have one of the worlds best waterfronts but it is marred by the port facilities. Any small step towards enhancing the waterfront and reducing buildings there will be a good move

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

Same reason as 5a above

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> |



#3541



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <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>Introduce the Franklin Local Board 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> |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Over the years we have increased our debt so that there is no wiggle room in the budget and so we need to concentrate on core services and forget expensive showy projects.



#3541



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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and | Not Important |



#3541



| | |
|---|------------------|
| other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

We should focus on core services - water, sewerage and rubbish. Other items are luxuries that we could look at once we have started tom live within our means

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?

Just operate with fiscal responsibility.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

public transport faster and more reliable.

happy to pay a 10% increase every year if we get a better city.



#3568



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

salaries to council staff are out of control: far higher than needed to attract personnel.

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?

bus lanes.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

the projected profit of 7.5% every year on the investments is nonsense.

the fund will be raided by the next council.



#3568



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

long term lease is the same as privatisation.

this land must remain public.

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:

the profit should be used to develop a rail link that reduces truck congestion in the central city.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#3568



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

to future proof this area for shipping.

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. | |
| Continue the planned roll 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 |



#3568



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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. | 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?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our | Fairly Important |
|--|------------------|



#3568



| | |
|---|------------------|
| community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

prohibit high rise buildings in Hibiscus area.

8. Do you have any other comments?

prohibit high rise buildings in Hibiscus area. we want to retain our point of difference, and our village feel.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | As proposed |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I think if the council completed the above areas as outlined in the proposal, and did them really well (as opposed to a slipshod job) I would be very happy. We could then move onto the next list of jobs without having to backtrack.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Nothing

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

I think that the cycle ways and walkways still need constructing as an alternative to public transport.. I regularly use the walkway next to the cycleway and it is terrific.

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

No, do what is outlined well, but don't forget cycleways and walkways.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

No, it all needs doing.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

We need to maintain all the green spaces we have.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:

I think the Auckland Future Fund is a good thing in principle, but I don't think the Airport shares should ever be found.



#3585



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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 think the council should retain ownership and control over 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:

I think a fund to future proof against disasters would be great.

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:

The waterfront is a great asset and should be maximised for public good.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?



#3585



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

We need an operational area.

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 | Support |



#3585



| | |
|---|---------|
| 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?

No

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#3585



| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Very Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Excellent

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?

Get rid of food scrap bins or at least make it a year pay system



#3613



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?

Safer crossings, more yellow lines to reduce cars parking on both sides of 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?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#3613



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

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 | I don't know |



#3613



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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 |



#3613



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



#3613



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.

Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Fairly Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 | 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?



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:



#3614



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?

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <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> |



#3614



| | |
|---|----------------|
| we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate 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. | 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. | Support |



#3614



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Very Important |



#3614



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.

Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Very Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



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?



#3633



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>Support</p> |



#3633



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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?



#3633



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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | Do less |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#3643



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:



#3643



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 we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in | I don't know |



#3643



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| <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>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> |



#3643



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna. | I don't know |
| Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces. | I don't know |
| Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan. | I don't know |
| Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu. | I don't know |
| Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike. | I don't know |



#3643



| | |
|--|--------------|
| Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park. | I don't know |
| Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances. | I don't know |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

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?



#3645



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation 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?



#3645



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> |



#3645



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | 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> | 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 |



#3645



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity | Fairly Important |



#3645



in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.

Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.

Very Important

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do 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?

Give North Harbour Stadium back to the Trust to run

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3662



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Bus services on North Shore need updating. More buses before and after school. Too many services cancelled

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

North Harbour Stadium

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

High, car damaging, Bumpy pedestrian crossings

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Because it was much better run outside Council

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Where else can the money come from



#3662



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Private enterprise can run it better and future fund needs capital

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:

Look forward

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

For public benefit and gain income

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#3662



Tell us why:

As above

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>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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> | |



#3662



| | |
|--|--|
| <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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| <p>Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who</p> | <p>Not Important</p> |
|---|----------------------|



#3662



| | |
|---|------------------|
| does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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?

Save NOrth Harbour Stadium



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?



#3671



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

There is no reason to believe that the income from investing the funds from the sale, net of selling costs, will be significantly greater than the return from the current assets.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:



#3671



The port's operations should be moved to Northport, with improved rail access, and the Port of Tauranga with the land being used as a public amenity, including stadia and entertainment facilities - not sold for tower blocks.

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:

See above

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

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

Support



#3671



| | |
|--|----------------|
| <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> | Do not 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> | 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 |



#3671



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract 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?

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?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |



#3671



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do more |
| Council support | Do more |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#3687



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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 around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p> | <p>Do not support</p> |
|---|-----------------------|



#3687



| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <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> |
| <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> |



#3687



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Albert-Eden,Aotea/Great Barrier,Hibiscus and Bays

Albert-Eden Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Albert-Eden in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Celebrating different people and cultures, bringing people together with fun and engaging activities, and reducing barriers for those who might struggle to connect with council or others in the community.

Continuing our environmental work through tree planting, parks restoration, supporting volunteer pest control and planting groups and helping community climate action through our Climate Activator.

Planning for how our parks and open space can respond to growth, making the most of what we have, balancing different uses and connecting green spaces together.



#3687



| | |
|---|--|
| Supporting our community groups with funding, information, learning new skills and building their capability and networks. | |
| Settling in at the new, medium-term location for the Pt Chevalier library and continuing to investigate what the long-term library solution might be and how we will fund it. | |
| Working with the community on activations in the Mt Albert Civic Square. | |
| Making our parks rubbish-bin free to minimise waste and improve environmental and climate outcomes. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Albert-Eden proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Aotea/Great Barrier in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Continue the regular programme of funding for community groups to deliver services and environmental groups to deliver ecology works. | |
| Continue our regular maintenance of parks and assets. | |
| Investigate improvements for playground areas island-wide. | |
| Support implementation of aspects of the new Destination Management Plan. | |



#3687



Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Aotea/Great Barrier proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|--|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and | |



#3687



| | |
|---|--|
| other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do more |
| Environment and regulation | Do 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?

Public transport funding and incentives to get people on the road.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3696



Do less cultural events. Reduce overall spending on administration and non productive cost. Temporary suspension of environmental initiatives if necessary.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

In general supportive of the proposal but hoping to see good value for money judgement made on each projects. The reality is that we do see wastage of digging twice of the same spot

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport initiatives such as buses and T2 lanes

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Maintenance swiftness. Adjust level of service if required to get better planning of area management. Less administrators

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:



#3696



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:



#3696



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>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> |



#3696



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipātiki, Upper Harbour

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Fairly Important |



#3696



| | |
|---|----------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Not Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Kaipātiki in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#3696



| | |
|--|------------------|
| Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs. | Fairly Important |
| Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community | Not Important |
| Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control. | Very Important |
| Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation. | Fairly Important |
| Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan. | Not Important |
| Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?



#3696



I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond. | Not Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan. | Not Important |
| Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work. | Not Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy. | Fairly Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan. | Fairly Important |
| Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment. | Not Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell



#3696



land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do more |
| Parks and Community | Do more |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

We need to keep the stadium, it just needs to be used more often! Increase the corporate options on the main stand and put permanent seating around the outside to improve the atmosphere and capacity.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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?



#3701



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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> | |



#3701



| | |
|---|--|
| 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?



#3701



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Transport | |
| Water | |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop wasting money i.e. adding Maori to all parks etc, unnecessary consultants fees, stop funding unnecessary projects and donations. Only proceed with necessary projects



#3715



Put a freeze on all Council members salaries

Actually listen to what the public are thinking and stop being so woke

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Make it actually work, by that I mean less lip service, more accountability and reliability

2a. Is there anything you 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:

Start allowing more activities there, like music festivals, markets, more for the people and less of the bureaucracy

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#3715



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

Move the ports and turn prime land into a profitable venture

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port 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?



#3715



| | |
|--|---------|
| <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> | 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> | |
| <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> | |



#3715



| | |
|---|--|
| 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?

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?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through | Very Important |



#3715



| | |
|---|------------------|
| methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Very Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Not Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Get back to basics and work on needs not wants

8. Do you have any other comments?

Councillors need to listen to the people they represent, I believe a lot have forgotten they are meant to be the voice of the majority, not their own or woke personal beliefs



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | Do less |
| Parks and Community | Do less |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | Do less |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#3728



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> |



#3728



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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. | 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?



#3728



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: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do less |
| Water | As proposed |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | 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?

Take over the ferry contract from AT and provide reliable, affordable ferry services to the North Shore and Gulf Harbour.

This will take the pressure off the road transport systems, encourage more people to enjoy the city and reduce commuter stress.



#3738



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Bureaucratic jobs. Get some proper commercially-minded business people into management. Run the council more like a business with rewards for achieving goals and consequences for under-achievement (including firing).

Rely less on expensive "consultants" and do some thinking of your own. It's really not that difficult.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Makes sense.

Also remove/repurpose all the unused cycleways, like that pink strip from K road to the city. I've watched it and if you see one bicycle every 30 minutes that's a lot. What a waste of money. The cycleways are also clogging up the city centre and nobody is using them

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Improved ferry services to take the pressure off the roading system

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Cycleways

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:



#3738



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Other

Tell us here:

Move the port elsewhere and redevelop the land for the benefit of Auckland residents and visitors. Create a world-class waterfront city whilst getting rid of freight through the central city

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

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:



#3738



Move the port elsewhere and redevelop the land for the benefit of Auckland residents and visitors. Create a world-class waterfront city whilst getting rid of freight through the central city

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

Move the port elsewhere and redevelop the land for the benefit of Auckland residents and visitors. Create a world-class waterfront city whilst getting rid of freight through the central city

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> |



#3738



| | |
|---|--------------|
| Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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. | 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. | Support |

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays



#3738



Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Fairly Important |
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Very Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Very Important |

Tell us why



#3738



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

The document only goes to page 77

8. Do you have any other comments?

Save the Gulf Harbour Golf Course from redevelopment.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | Do more |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | As proposed |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | As proposed |
| Economic and cultural development | Do less |
| Council support | As proposed |

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

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?



#3749



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> |



#3749



| | |
|---|----------------|
| 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. | 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?



#3749



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney

Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park. | Fairly Important |
| Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024. | Fairly Important |
| Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity. | Very Important |
| Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction. | Very Important |



#3749



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve. | Fairly Important |
| Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

8. Do you have any other comments?



#3750

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Hibiscus and Bays

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Transport | As proposed |
| Water | Do more |
| City and local development | Do less |
| Environment and regulation | As proposed |
| Parks and Community | 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?

Transport

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#3750



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

Supports improving productivity

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

Tell us why:

Better utilisation will reduce costs and provide for the community

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Fund focused on best return on investment rather ideological beliefs

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



Tell us here:

Leverage knowledge and expertise of specialist port operator

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

Again will provide the best returns

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Long term the port will be relocated so let's start now and reap the benefits of the harbour facing location

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

As above



#3750



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>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> |



#3750



| | |
|---|--------------|
| 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?

Nil

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?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies. | Very Important |
|---|----------------|



#3750



| | |
|---|------------------|
| Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting. | Fairly Important |
| Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all. | Fairly Important |
| Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport. | Fairly Important |

Tell us why

Looking after our local environment

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

All good

8. Do you have any other comments?

Nil